

CURRENT NEWS **EARLY BIRD**

FRIDAY, May 22, 1998

USA Today

May 22, 1998

Pg. 1

CIA: China's Launchers, Missiles Similar

By The Associated Press

WASHINGTON - Amid persistent questions about whether U.S. firms provided missile technology to China, a Senate panel released CIA information Thursday underscoring similarities between Chinese satellite launchers and long-range nuclear missiles.

Staging mechanisms, guidance systems, re-entry vehicles, and rocket motors all involve identical or similar technology, the CIA said in a rare public disclosure of intelligence that it supplies to congressional committees. What emerged Thursday were releasable portions of a broader, classified briefing the CIA gave Senate investigators on Chinese missile and space launch capability last week.

Weeks earlier, the CIA provided top officials with a classified assessment saying that 13 of China's intercontinental ballistic missiles are targeted at U.S. cities.

Congressional Republicans are opening investigations into concerns that a satellite export

approved by President Clinton this year for a company headed by a major Democratic donor may have aided China's missile programs.

Administration critics say the similarity between satellite launch vehicles and ICBMs increases the chances that Clinton's export decisions may have led to the disclosure of valuable military technology. The administration counterattacked on multiple fronts.

"No controlled information relative to ballistic missiles or warhead delivery technology has been authorized to be made available to Chinese authorities," said State Department spokesman James Rubin. "The whole underlying suggestion that somehow we want to transfer technology to the Chinese ... is simply fatuous."

Investigations of the export license deal are under way both on Capitol Hill and at the Justice Department. The Justice probe focuses whether U.S. trade policy may have been affected by campaign fund raising.

A CIA chart released

Thursday by the Senate Governmental Affairs international security subcommittee, which is investigating the issue, indicated that only one aspect of a rocket - the payload - differs substantially between civilian satellite launchers and nuclear weapons-tipped missiles. In other respects they are identical or similar:

- *Re-entry vehicles would operate similarly whether the object was a commercial capsule carrying such things as photographs and data or a nuclear weapon.

- *Payload separation from the rocket would involve similar procedures for a satellite or nuclear weapons. Inertial guidance and control systems would use "similar hardware with tailored software."

- *Staging mechanisms, rocket propellants, air frame and motor cases, insulation and liners, engines or rocket motors, and thrust vector controls would be the same.

- *Exhaust nozzles are "similar and usually identical."

"It is important to understand how foreign countries

can apply information and technology gained from launching U.S. satellites to their own ICBM and satellite programs, and whether the administration's current policy is sufficient to prevent this," said Sen. Thad Cochran, R-Miss., the subcommittee's chairman.

Additional CIA briefing papers not made public by Senate investigators but obtained Thursday by The Associated Press point to other differences between ICBMs and satellite launchers.

ICBMs must be more rugged and more easily maintained because they are designed to sit in silos for long periods, according to the CIA material.

"Instruments such as gyros and accelerometers adequate for a (satellite) space-launch vehicle might not be good enough for an ICBM," the CIA briefing paper stated. In addition, a satellite launcher "does not necessarily have to control satellite release to as tight a tolerance" as an ICBM.

In 1996, Loral Space & Communications and Hughes Electronics hired a government-owned Chinese rocket manufacturer to launch a com-

Experts Discount A One-Time Leak Of U.S. Data

Philadelphia Inquirer...See Pg. 2

Clinton Agrees To Land-Mine Ban, But Not Yet

New York Times...See Pg. 3

President Steps Up Efforts Against Terrorism

New York Times...See Pg. 4



This publication is prepared by American Forces Information Service (AFIS/OASD-PA) to bring to the attention of key personnel news items of interest to them in their official capacities. It is not intended to substitute for newspapers and periodicals as a means of keeping informed about the meaning and impact of news developments. Use of these articles does not reflect official endorsement. Further reproduction for private use or gain is subject to original copyright restrictions. Please pass this copy on to someone else who needs current news information, then...



mercial satellite into space. Under U.S. export laws, the satellite itself would not be handled by the Chinese. But when the rocket exploded, the Pentagon says, Loral and Hughes provided China with an accident assessment that contained valuable missile-related information.

Republicans want to know why, with a Justice Department

probe still pending, Clinton this February approved another satellite export by Loral, and whether the generous Democratic donations by Loral board chairman Bernard Schwartz had anything to do with the decision. The administration and Loral both deny any such allegation.

Witnesses at Thursday's hearing supported the CIA's

conclusions about the similarity of ICBMs and satellite launchers.

"The essential elements of an ICBM are the same with the exception of the payload," said William Graham, former deputy administrator of NASA and science adviser to Presidents Reagan and Bush. "Put another way, if you have a space-launch vehicle, you also have

an ICBM."

But John Pike, director of space policy for the Federation of American Scientists, said it was naive to think China gained much from U.S. firms. China has had missiles that could reach the United States since 1981, and newly acquired information would make only a marginal difference, he said.

Experts discount a one-time leak of U.S. data

Philadelphia Inquirer
May 22, 1998
Pg. 3

By Michael D. Towle

INQUIRER WASHINGTON BUREAU

WASHINGTON — If China has gained expertise in ballistic missiles from U.S.-approved technology transfers, it has come from 10 years of launching American-made satellites, not a one-time alleged leak of sensitive information, according to industry experts.

Still, those experts could not say exactly what the Chinese have learned — and whether it has compromised U.S. security interests, as President Clinton's congressional critics have contended.

Many of the industry observers testifying before a Senate panel yesterday said the Chinese probably gained little from their work with American satellite companies that would have caused China's missile capabilities to leap ahead.

"There is no indication in the public record of an actual identifiable harm to the American security interests," John Pike, director of the Space Policy Project at the Federation of American Scientists, told a Senate Committee on Governmental Affairs subcommittee.

"Irresponsible public claims to the contrary, China today has no capabilities to attack the United States that it did not have a year ago or a decade ago," said Pike.

But others, including William Graham, former deputy administrator of NASA and science adviser to Presidents Ronald Reagan and George Bush, said it was impossible for China to be launching U.S. satellites without learning about their technology.

"The integration of the payload

... requires an intimate knowledge of both the payload and the launch vehicle," said Graham. "This is not like putting a load into the back of a truck. A great deal of detailed technical information must be exchanged between the satellite's designers and ... the vehicle's designers."

Graham noted that simply launching satellites had enabled the Chinese to practice and improve their techniques for launching long-range rockets or armed missiles, which experts say fly using largely the same technology.

The controversy is rooted in part in the high cost of launching multi-million-dollar satellites. Those launched in China are mostly commercial and involve uses such as transmitting television and digital pager signals.

The Chinese, eager to build a lucrative industry, charge satellite-makers such as Loral Space & Communications and Hughes Electronics millions of dollars less per launch than their U.S. counterparts do. By using China, American companies also avoid a long waiting list for launches at home.

In fact, the U.S. government on 20 occasions since 1989 has approved the launching in China of satellites made wholly or partly by U.S. companies.

The risk to the secu-

rity of the United States was viewed as minimal until the February 1996 crash of the Long March rocket — the workhorse of China's growing space-launch industry. In that episode, the rocket came crashing back to Earth shortly after take-off, with a satellite made by Loral and Hughes fixed in its payload.

Loral's and Hughes' actions following the crash are at the heart of the increasingly shrill allegations of security breaches.

In an effort to identify the cause of the crash, Loral sent a team of employees to China and prepared a report of the incident.

Critics contend that in an effort to preserve the American companies' use of a low-cost launch vehicle and appease nervous insurance underwriters, Loral and Hughes gave away information on sophisticated rocket guidance systems that the Pentagon had wanted kept secret.

Loral acknowledges it was under pressure from insurance companies to do its own review of the accident before future launches in China would be insured. But it denies that it gave away secret information.

Loral also said that its review found the same result as Chinese investigators and that the American team did not provide any data or perform any tests for the Chinese.

But in a statement, the company acknowledged that it "provided a report to the Chinese before consulting with State Department ex-

EARLY BIRD WEBSITE

The Current News *Early Bird*, *Supplement*, and *Radio-TV Defense Dialog* are available at <http://ebird.dtic.mil>. Read detailed instructions on the *Early Bird* "home page" or call (703) 695-2884 or DSN 225-2884. These electronic publications are intended only for DoD and .mil sites and cannot be made available to any other addresses.

port licensing authorities."

Sen. Fred Thompson (R., Tenn.) said the issue showed the need for greater oversight of the industry but said he was not certain he wanted to ban launches abroad of American satellites. "We do know that it is very much in the interest of our commercial enterprises for these missiles carrying these satellites to work," he said.

Sen. Carl Levin (D., Mich.) said the Clinton administration had regulated China's launches the same way past administrations have.

Clinton Signs NATO Expansion Bill

Capping one of his biggest foreign policy victories, President Clinton yesterday formally approved expanding the NATO military alliance to include the former Soviet satellites of Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic.

In a White House ceremony, the president signed the instrument of ratification the Senate passed April 30. It would add the three nations by amending the 1949 North Atlantic Treaty. All 16 NATO members must ratify the treaty amendment to bring in the new countries.

Washington Post
May 22, 1998
Pg. 8

Clinton Agrees To Land-Mine Ban, But Not Yet

New York Times May 22, 1998

By Steven Lee Myers

WASHINGTON -- In a shift in policy, the Clinton administration has pledged that by 2006 the United States will sign the international treaty that bans anti-personnel land mines, but only if the Pentagon comes up with an alternative weapon, administration officials said Thursday.

Although President Clinton has voiced support for banning the most pernicious types of land mines, the administration had previously refused to commit itself to signing the treaty, known as the Ottawa Convention after the city where more than 100 countries agreed to a ban last December.

The administration's pledge -- made in a May 15 letter from the president's national security adviser, Sandy Berger, to Sen. Patrick Leahy, D-Vt. -- contains a very big caveat: The administration did not set a firm deadline for the Pentagon to come up with an alternative.

For that reason the pledge is symbolic, in large part because Clinton will no longer be president by 2006. However, the administration's pledge sets a path to bring the United States into compliance with the treaty.

The Pentagon resisted setting a firm deadline for finding alternatives in a series of intense internal discussions in recent weeks, even as some officials in the State Department and the National Security

Council pressed for a firmer deadline. And Thursday officials at the Pentagon played down the real impact of the administration's pledge.

"It's optimistic to say you can have alternatives by any deadline," a senior defense official said Thursday. "Right now no one can tell you what an alternative would even look like."

Nonetheless, the administration's latest position is an evolution from the stance it took last December when it refused to sign the Ottawa treaty and declined to say that the United States would ever do so. For that reason, supporters of an international ban on land mines welcomed it Thursday as a step toward the day when the United States would join the 125 other countries that have signed it.

"Now it becomes a question not of if we'll sign it, but when," said Leahy, who has been one of the leading advocates for an international ban.

The administration's pledge emerged as a result of a showdown with Leahy over a little-noticed law that imposes a moratorium on the use of anti-personnel land mines, starting next February.

That moratorium, sponsored by Leahy, became law more than two years ago -- long before the international treaty became an issue -- and remained on the books despite the administration's opposition

to a ban, raising concerns among the nation's military leaders, who feared a moratorium could leave troops overseas vulnerable to attacks.

In exchange for the administration's pledge to sign the Ottawa declaration, Leahy said Thursday that he would agree to support what amounts to a repeal of the moratorium, allowing the administration to waive it on national security grounds. The moratorium was already challenged: The House has passed legislation repealing it and on Thursday the powerful chairman of the Senate's Committee on Foreign Relations, Jesse Helms, R-N.C., sent his colleagues a letter strongly opposing it.

Helms also attacked the administration for negotiating with Leahy on the Ottawa treaty, saying that "some within the executive branch are all too willing to accede to this blackmail." He called for an unconditional repeal of the moratorium.

The Ottawa treaty bans the manufacture, stockpiling and use of land mines specifically intended to kill or maim individuals. It does not, however, prohibit anti-tank mines. The problem for the United States is that the Pentagon designed its anti-tank mines in a way that mixed in anti-personnel mines to keep enemy soldiers from defusing the anti-tank weapons.

In last-minute negotiations in Ottawa, the treaty's authors

refused to grant the United States an exemption for these so-called mixed systems, although several countries were allowed to keep their anti-tank mines with other kinds of anti-tampering devices.

Clinton has pledged that the United States will unilaterally halt its use of anti-personnel land mines everywhere except in Korea by 2003 and altogether by 2006. But those dates specifically did not apply to the anti-tank "mixed systems," the main stumbling block on signing the Ottawa treaty. By pledging to sign at some point, the administration has now put added pressure on the military to develop alternatives sooner. Indeed, the administration has called on the Pentagon to "search aggressively" for alternatives.

Bobby Muller, the president of the Vietnam Veterans of America Foundation and a leader of the international campaign against land mines, noted that many military experts already believed that alternatives to the anti-personnel land mines exist, although the Pentagon disputes that.

"The pledge shifts the debates from the treaty to the alternatives," Muller said, adding that the pressure would grow on the United States to sign the Ottawa treaty sooner than 2006. "And with that we're going to put this over the goal line."

Washington Post

May 22, 1998

Pg. 36

N. Korea to Hold 1st Election in 8 Years

SEOUL—North Korea's official news agency said elections to North Korea's parliament, the Supreme People's Assembly, would be held July 26, the first poll in eight years in the secretive

Communist state.

The move could pave the way for Kim Jong Il, de facto leader since the 1994 death of Kim Il Sung, to formally succeed his father as state president, completing the communist world's first dynastic succession, analysts said.

President Steps Up Efforts Against Terrorism

New York Times
May 22, 1998

By Judith Miller

The Defense Department has decided to spend \$50 million to create "biological response units" in the National Guards of 10 of the largest states, government officials said Thursday.

Meanwhile, President Clinton prepared to unveil on Friday a series of other actions to boost the nation's defenses against germ attacks.

The steps are all part of the president's increasing effort to protect the nation against what he has called biological, computer and other "21st century threats" to national security. Clinton will address these threats and his program for combating them in a speech at the U.S. Naval Academy in Annapolis, Md.

The measures include a long-planned consolidation of the government's system for responding to such emergencies; the making and stockpiling of early-warning equipment, drugs and vaccines, and a

commitment to spend more money on research and development aimed at strengthening the public health system and the ability of cities to respond to germ terrorism and other high-technological emergencies.

The White House has asked government agencies to produce estimates of the costs of the new steps within two weeks. But an expert advisory panel has urged Clinton to ask Congress to approve \$2 billion as soon as possible to be spent over the next five years to "fill in the gaps in the nation's emergency preparedness system," one official said.

Officials stressed that the president's program would enhance the government's ability to deal not only with germ terrorism but also the threat of infection from other relatively new disease-causing agents, such as the virus that causes AIDS.

"With the revolution in genetic engineering, it is now possible to unravel how germs

produce infections and to develop more effective medicines in blocking them," said Frank Young, the former director of the Department of Health and Human Services' emergency preparedness office and the head of the advisory panel that briefed Clinton last month at the White House. "Particularly relevant is the application of biotechnology to detecting and identifying germs within three to four hours, rather than days."

Young declined to discuss other recommendations in his panel's 16-page report, but officials familiar with the document said that it urged Clinton to stockpile enough vaccine and antibiotics to combat a biological warfare attack in which up to 6 million Americans were infected.

Meanwhile, a scientific panel headed by the Department of Health and Human Services is calling for stockpiling and other preparations for up to 30 million people, officials said.

Before the speech, Clinton

is also expected to sign two measures to implement his terrorism policy. In his speech, aides said, Clinton will finally announce plans to hire a national coordinator to initiate anti-terrorist action, secure aid and iron out government disputes.

Senior government officials told several reporters of the contents of the speech earlier this week on the condition that nothing be written before it was delivered. But other officials described the measures and the speech's content in greater detail on Thursday after at least two newspapers published accounts of the talk.

An administration official said that the Defense Department's 10 new National Guard biological response units would be deployed to help towns and cities cope with a germ attack. The designated states are Massachusetts, New York, Pennsylvania, Georgia, Illinois, Texas, Missouri, Colorado, California and Washington.

Washington Times

May 22, 1998

Pg. 3

House OKs plan to allow troops to guard U.S. borders

ASSOCIATED PRESS

The House voted yesterday to authorize enlisting the military to help patrol U.S. borders in the war against drug smuggling and illegal immigration. Opponents said the plan could turn the U.S.-Mexico border into an armed corridor.

The 288-132 vote approving the experiment came as the House neared completion of a \$270 billion defense spending bill for the fiscal year that begins Oct. 1.

The overall legislation includes \$1.9 billion to keep U.S. forces in Bosnia and provides a 3.6 percent pay raise for the military — half a percentage point more than the Clinton administration requested.

It also includes a ban on further exports of high technology to China. And it is notable for one thing it doesn't include: another round of base closings sought by the Clinton administration.

In an emotional debate, lawmakers sparred over whether the Pentagon could — or should — be called upon to deploy forces for "monitoring and patrolling" the U.S.-Mexico border.

Rep. James A. Traficant Jr., Ohio Democrat, sponsor of the amend-

ment, told the House the legislation only authorizes such a deployment — and doesn't require it.

First, the Immigration and Naturalization Service or the Customs Service would have to request the help — and the defense secretary would have to approve it.

The Defense Department opposes the measure.

"Maybe the Pentagon doesn't want it," Mr. Traficant said. "The American people not only want it, they need it."

But opponents said that border patrolling was not a legitimate function of an already resource-strapped Defense Department.

"We shouldn't put thousands of Army soldiers on the border of Texas," said Rep. Chet Edwards, Texas Democrat.

He said it would "make the Texas-Mexican border look like East Berlin after World War II."

But Rep. Charlie Norwood, Georgia Republican, said, "It is time this country did something about drugs. Put the 82nd Airborne on maneuvers down there if you want to stop drugs."

Rep. Steney Hoyer, Maryland Democrat, said, "I'm concerned

about conserving the resources we have available for keeping our nation secure. We may not like being the sole superpower in the world. But that which we are, we are."

Mr. Traficant retorted: "The border is a national security issue. I know the politics of this place. But I've got kids dying of overdoses, and no one is doing anything about it. If we aren't going to protect our borders, who's going to do it? Japan? Maybe China now?"

Rep. Silvestre Reyes, Texas Democrat, a former U.S. Border Patrol regional chief, argued against the measure, telling the House: "I can tell you, military on the border is a bad idea."

The House rejected a watered-down version Mr. Reyes sponsored that would have allowed the military to permit only reconnaissance missions on the border, and then only under certain circumstances.

The annual defense bill authorizes \$270.4 billion for fiscal 1999, roughly the same amount as last year.

The bill provides \$3.8 billion for ballistic missile defense, \$417 million to assist in removing military and nuclear threats from the for-

mer Soviet Union, and \$1.9 billion for troops in Bosnia.

House members rejected, by voice vote, an attempt by Rep. Barney Frank, Massachusetts Democrat, to bring to the floor an amendment that would require the 8,500 U.S. troops now in Bosnia to be brought home by year's end.

"We could save \$2 billion a year by telling the Europeans it's their

turn to do Bosnia," Mr. Frank said.

In other action yesterday, the House:

- Approved an amendment by Sen. Edward Markey, Massachusetts Democrat, to bar civilian nuclear reactors from being used to produce tritium for nuclear weapons. Tritium, a radioactive isotope of hydrogen, is a key ingredient in nuclear bombs.

- Adopted an amendment urging legislative tax writers to extend the new capital-gains tax break for selling a home to military personnel serving abroad.

- Agreed to give military retirees over the age of 65 the option of enrolling in a health care program that covers retired federal government workers.

Washington Times

May 22, 1998

Pg. 1

Pentagon's Bacon 'sorry' about Tripp leak, says he acted on his own

By Bill Sammon and Paul Bedard
THE WASHINGTON TIMES

Assistant Defense Secretary Kenneth Bacon said yesterday he's sorry he did not check with Linda Tripp's attorneys before leaking information from her personnel file to a reporter.

He said he was not following instructions from the White House.

"In retrospect, I'm sorry that the incident occurred," Mr. Bacon told a Pentagon briefing. "I'm sorry that I did not check with our lawyers or check with Linda Tripp's lawyers about this."

Mrs. Tripp is the Pentagon employee who tape-recorded Monica Lewinsky's accounts of a sexual relationship with President Clinton. Miss Lewinsky was Mr. Bacon's aide-de-camp after working at the White House as an intern.

Asked whether the White House ordered the leak, Mr. Bacon said: "Absolutely not. That's been one of the major misconceptions — I think, mischievous misconceptions — about this."

He said he spoke with "no superior inside this building or outside this building about this incident until after it happened," which was on March 13.

Since then, Mr. Bacon said, he has "had extensive discussions" with Defense Secretary William S. Cohen about the Tripp leak. He declined to say whether he has offered Mr. Cohen his resignation or has been reprimanded.

Asked whether he still has Mr. Cohen's full confidence, Mr. Bacon said: "I'm here. And the secretary's view is that we should let [the inspector general] do her work."

The Pentagon inspector general has been asked by Mr. Cohen to investigate the leak. Mr. Cohen is believed to be generally pleased with Mr. Bacon's job performance, but he has said Mrs. Tripp's personnel information "was supposed to be protected by the privacy

rules" and called its release "certainly inappropriate, if not illegal."

Yesterday, White House Press Secretary Michael McCurry suggested there would be some kind of punishment of those involved in the Tripp leak once the Pentagon probe is completed. "I think that they have to establish over there the factual record and then it's going to have to be dealt with and I don't want to say anything more than that," he said.

Jim Nicholson, chairman of the Republican National Committee, yesterday cited Mr. Clinton's 1992 charge that Bush administration officials had rifled his passport file. At the time, Mr. Clinton promised if there were similar privacy violations in his administration, "you will not have an inquiry or rigmarole or anything else. If I catch anyone using the State Department like that when I'm president, I'll fire them the next day."

Mr. Nicholson said: "President Clinton should keep his word and fire Bacon for violating the Privacy Act."

Asked about that pledge, Mr. McCurry said yesterday, "There's no need for the White House to look into it, because the inspector general at the Pentagon is looking into it." He told reporters to wait "until the inspector general's report had been concluded."

Mr. McCurry said he and Mr. Bacon discussed the leak before their separate press briefings yesterday. Asked whether the White House had ordered the leak, Mr. McCurry said: "I can say that that is not the case."

Mr. Bacon was asked for the Tripp file by Jane Mayer, a reporter for the New Yorker magazine who had once worked with him at the Wall Street Journal. Although she uses her maiden name, Mayer, in her byline, she asked that she be identified in newspaper accounts as Mrs. Hamilton because she is married to William Hamilton, the national editor of

The Washington Post.

She told Mr. Bacon she had information that Mrs. Tripp had been detained by police as a teenager in 1969 and had denied the arrest when she filled out a Pentagon form in 1987.

Although Mr. Bacon said he cited the Privacy Act to Mrs. Hamilton, he nevertheless asked several Pentagon officials for this information. His principal deputy, Clifford H. Bernath, went to some lengths to obtain the desired form, in the process setting off alarm bells in the Pentagon's office on Privacy and the Freedom of Information Act.

On March 13, Mr. Bernath took the form to his boss, who read it and approved its release.

"I said, 'This looks like it's the form,'" Mr. Bacon recounted in a May 15 deposition to Judicial Watch, a legal-advocacy foundation. "And [Mr. Bernath] said, 'I guess that we can tell her we got the information.' I said, 'I guess we can.'"

Asked by Judicial Watch director Larry Klayman whether he instructed Mr. Bernath to make sure the release would not violate the Privacy Act, Mr. Bacon replied: "Unfortunately, I did not."

He said: "Looking back on it, I wish I had asked the question about the Privacy Act. But I did not."

Citing Mrs. Tripp's denial of the arrest, Jane Hamilton raised questions about her credibility in a profile published by the New Yorker. But in the following days, it became clear that Mrs. Tripp's arrest had been little more than a teenage prank gone awry. Attention shifted away from the 29-year-old incident and onto the Pentagon's decision to leak the information.

Mrs. Hamilton discounts the importance of the leak. "He answered a question when I called him up and asked," she said. Whether Mr. Bacon was breaking the law "never crossed my mind,"

she said.

She compared the publication of Mrs. Tripp's personnel information to the New York Times' publication of the Pentagon Papers.

Mrs. Hamilton, who has been subpoenaed by Judicial Watch over the leak, called a story on the topic in yesterday's editions of The Washington Times a "piece of [foully odoriferous sewage]" and

criticized a reporter for "making such a stink over how people get their information."

"You've spent all this time trying to figure out whether Ken Bacon broke a law," Mrs. Hamilton said. "I haven't seen you spend any time on Linda Tripp. Did she break a law?"

Mr. Bacon's distribution of the

Tripp information appears to contradict a pledge he made in March 1996 to Sen. Strom Thurmond, chairman of the Armed Services Committee.

"I will continue to ensure that the release of information is consistent with the provisions of applicable statutes, executive orders and Department of Defense directives and instructions," Mr. Bacon said.

Washington Post

May 22, 1998

Pg. 1

Habibie Promises To Heed Cries For Reform

Indonesians' Support For Leader Unclear

By Keith B. Richburg
Washington Post
Foreign Service

JAKARTA, Indonesia, May 21—Indonesia's new president, B.J. Habibie, told his anxious countrymen today that he had heard their collective cry for change, and he promised a government free of the corrupt practices of the past.

But in his brief maiden address to a public gripped by weeks of political and economic turmoil, he also dashed widespread hopes that his would be only an interim presidency during the transition to a new, more democratic political order. He made no mention of fresh elections -- an offer his predecessor, Suharto, had held out just two days ago -- suggesting that he intends to complete Suharto's unfinished term, which ends in 2003.

The extent of popular support for Habibie is not yet apparent, however. There are concerns about the long-term backing of the country's powerful military with which Habibie has clashed in the past.

Several times in his speech, Habibie, 61, a German-trained engineer, mentioned the generational change underway in Indonesia, and how the "people power" revolt that toppled his mentor, Suharto, was led mainly by university students.

"The student struggle has accelerated the process of reform with a fresh wind that is blowing us into the 21st century," Habibie said, sticking closely to a prepared text, glancing up only occasionally. "I have paid serious attention to the dynamism which has developed for total reform."

He promised to reform the world's fourth-most-populous

nation "in all areas -- restoring life in the social and economic fields, increasing democracy."

He also pledged to review the country's Draconian subversion laws, often used to jail critics of the regime, and to speed enactment of laws "abolishing monopoly practices and unfair competition."

He asked for support while he implements needed reforms. "Let us all end the conflict . . . as quickly as possible," he urged. And, with an eye to an international community nervous about his reputation as an economic nationalist who opposes liberalization, he also promised to honor Indonesia's foreign commitments, including the provisions of a \$43 billion economic bailout package agreed upon with the International Monetary Fund.

Habibie's short speech touched on all the student protesters' key demands. Still, many at the forefront of the reform struggle -- and some analysts observing from the sidelines -- questioned whether Habibie, the personification of the old system of nepotism, cronyism and personal patronage, can truly reform the system from within.

As the students who have occupied the country's parliament grounds this week debated their next step, the forces of change that their revolt unleashed seemed on a collision course with the interests of Jakarta's ruling elite. Many today openly predicted that Habibie would become the next casualty of the popular uprising, soon to be swept up by a movement that may have grown too fast to be guided easily from above.

"Under his version, reforms should be conducted under

him, under Habibie," said Juwono Sudarsono, a respected academic who in March became Suharto's environment minister. "He would not be the object of reform."

Juwono said Habibie and his allies likely hope that Indonesians, weary of protests that have paralyzed the capital for the last eight days, are willing to give the new president a chance to implement his version of reform. "That's what Habibie's supporters are banking on," he said, "that people are tired and want some respite from events."

Juwono added, "My guess at the moment is he can't last three months."

Other outside analysts agreed, predicting that Habibie's presidency could be brief. "He just does not have the support and is therefore not viable," said Eugene Galbraith, an Indonesia analyst with ABN-Amro Bank in Hong Kong. "One does not unwind 25 years of resentment in six hours."

A Western diplomat here, asked to assess Habibie's prospects, replied, "Short-lived." Asked if Habibie could survive for the four years and 10 months remaining in Suharto's term, the diplomat replied, "Nobody but Habibie thinks that."

Some students still occupying the grounds of parliament were of a similar view. When they paused long enough in their celebration of Suharto's resignation, many became angry, even resentful, that Habibie -- seen as the ultimate Suharto crony -- has ascended to the presidency on the strength of their revolt.

"It's like having a photocopy of Suharto there. People will

not accept him," a young economics major said.

A key indicator of whether Habibie can win wider acceptance here is the makeup of the cabinet he is putting together. In his speech, he promised a cabinet that is "harmonious with this generation's aspirations and desires."

But some analysts said Habibie may have trouble attracting opposition politicians or people with genuine popular support, since many may run for future office and would not want to be associated with the Habibie administration.

One who is keeping his distance is Amien Rais, leader of Indonesia's second-largest Muslim organization and a self-declared presidential candidate. He has said he would give Habibie just six months in the job; today, after meeting him, Rais said he has no interest in serving in a Habibie cabinet.

"Even if he offers me a job, I will turn him down," Rais told reporters.

One factor driving the sentiment that Habibie may not last long is the suspicion that he does not enjoy the total support of Indonesia's powerful armed forces, or Abri.

The top Abri commanders are known to be long wary of the diminutive aeronautical engineer who boasted of the proximity of Suharto; the wariness became open hostility when Habibie used that friendship to force Abri to buy some components from his "strategic industries" -- interfering, in the military's view, with its procurement process.

Habibie is also the first civilian to serve as president after the nation's first leader, the independence hero Sukarno, and Suharto, a former five-star general.

Minutes after today's swearing-in, in a hasty ceremony at the presidential palace,

Habibie got a word of support from the commander of the armed forces, Gen. Wiranto, who like many Indonesians uses only one name.

But analysts today said that Wiranto's endorsement is lukewarm at best, because he was endorsing not Habibie but the constitutional process that passed power from the departing president to his vice president. And they noted the statement of support for Habibie came alongside a separate vow to continue to protect Suharto and his family.

Various analysts today speculated that Habibie may have been a compromise choice as a caretaker president, because Abri's hierarchy is itself too divided to come up with an alternate candidate. Wiranto often had been mentioned as Suharto's possible successor, but his rival in the top ranks is Lt. Gen. Prabowo Subianto, Suharto's son-in-law, said to have presidential ambitions of his own.

"I suspect there is more to come," said Harold Crouch, an Australian academic who has studied the Indonesian military. "Has this whole thing been engineered by Wiranto? And is there a deal between Habibie and Wiranto?"

Crouch said one sign to watch will be whether Wiranto retains his current post of defense minister, along with the job of armed forces commander, or whether Prabowo, who now heads the Army Strategic Reserve Command, is elevated.

Some here also questioned whether Suharto himself may have engineered Habibie's installation as president to maintain a continued strong role behind the scenes. Just last week, in Cairo, Suharto had mentioned the possibility that he might "step aside" -- not resign -- and become a pandito, or sage.

They noted that in his speech relinquishing power today, Suharto, speaking in the Indonesian language, Bahasa, did not use the word "resign" but said rather that he was "withdrawing" from the presidency. There have been precedents in Asia for aging leaders to publicly stand down but exert influence behind the scenes.

Habibie Needs Military Support To Succeed

By Mark Landler

JAKARTA, Indonesia -- Among the players in Indonesia's grand political drama this week, the army has been an elusive presence. Commonly thought to be the decisive force in Indonesian politics, the army and its powerful generals played no public role in pushing President Suharto to resign.

But the army left little doubt of its power, with the chief of the armed forces, Gen. Wiranto, publicly supporting Habibie on national television Thursday after Suharto resigned and delivering a short speech urging calm. Habibie said little during the proceedings, waiting until this evening to give a televised address.

Wiranto also issued a fresh warning against civil unrest. "The armed forces will take part in preventing any irregularities that could threaten the nation," he said in a terse statement while clutching his swagger stick.

As Habibie struggles to lay claim to his job in the face of widespread skepticism, the army will be critical to determining whether he survives more than a few weeks. While he is in office, some experts say, the army will call many of the shots.

But while the army will have a central role, several experts argued that Wiranto is using a more subtle and sophisticated strategy than the army used the last time Indonesia switched leaders, in the mid-1960s.

Then, a young major general named Suharto simply wrested power from Sukarno and became president himself. Now the army is allowing the change in leaders to occur within the bounds of the Constitution -- even letting Habibie, a civilian vice president for whom the military has shown no enthusiasm, take over.

"The traditional attitude of the armed forces is that they are more capable than civilians," said Umar Juoro, an

analyst at the Center for Information and Development Studies in Jakarta. "But Wiranto did not stand in the way."

The army's low profile may only be testament to behind-the-scenes manipulation. It is not known whether the taciturn Wiranto had veto power over Habibie, but one former general said Suharto was not pushed out by the military.

"Suharto stepped down because of pressure from the students and the common people, not because of the army," said Kemal Idris, a former lieutenant general in whose unit Wiranto served as a young officer.

Idris said he doubted that Wiranto had asked Suharto to resign, in part because the 52-year-old soldier is unshakably loyal to Suharto, having served as his aide-de-camp from 1988 to 1993. Moreover, he said, Wiranto is a cautious man, not given to risky gambles like showing his boss the door.

Whether Wiranto will keep to those traits in dealing with Habibie is another question. The two men are not known to be close, and Habibie lacks the broad power base once commanded by Suharto.

And Habibie, 61, and aeronautical engineer has had famously rocky relations with the army throughout his political career. As minister for research and technology, he amassed a sprawling empire of high-tech businesses, including an aircraft manufacturer and several military-technology companies. Senior military officials have long resented Habibie for interfering in procurement programs to steer lucrative contracts to state-owned companies under his control.

Wiranto may also now be in a stronger position within the army. Rumors of a split in the

military are legion. Wiranto's archrival, Lt. Gen. Prabowo Subianto, drew a lot of power from his ties to Suharto: He is married to the former president's daughter, Siti Hediati Harijadi. But now that Suharto is gone, said one Western diplomat, "Prabowo has to be a good boy, or he doesn't have much of a future in the army; his meteoric rise may have hit a plateau."

Wiranto has no shortage of political tools with which to challenge Habibie, or even shorten his tenure. The military is one of the Parliament's four main factions, occupying 75 of the 500 seats. Many of Indonesia's provincial governorships are held by former military officers. And retired officers like Idris form an outspoken and respected opposition camp.

Indonesia's army remains a potent force in society. During the recent riots and violence in Jakarta, the soldiers, with their plum and green berets, were applauded by student protesters. At Parliament Thursday, where students were celebrating Suharto's resignation, soldiers mingled with them in a show of solidarity. That would be hard to imagine in most other countries.

The students are demanding a special session of the Peoples Consultative Assembly to remove Habibie, whom they regard as a Suharto lackey. Indonesian soldiers always say they represent the will of the people -- a motto that could give the army a pretext to mount a constitutional challenge to Habibie.

So far, the army's reluctance to dictate events may partly reflect Wiranto's personality. But Idris said it may also reflect the military's recognition that the old ways of operating no longer apply. "In the reform movement, we must also ask about the role of the military in society," he said.

Iraq rejected a U.S. proposal to automatically renew limited sales of oil for the purchase of civilian supplies. Such sales, an exemption to U.N. sanctions, now come up for renewal every six months. Baghdad said avoiding such votes will prolong sanctions. Meanwhile, the State Department said Iran has resumed allowing Iraqi oil smuggling.

Wall Street
Journal
May 22, 1998
Pg. 1

India Shifts To Kinder, Gentler Diplomacy

Delhi Ends A-Tests, Will Consider Ban

By Kenneth J. Cooper
Washington Post
Foreign Service

NEW DELHI, May 21—India pulled back today from a series of heated diplomatic exchanges made in the aftermath of its nuclear weapons tests last week and sent conciliatory signals to Pakistan, China and the United States.

Delhi also delivered an even broader message to critics around the world, announcing a moratorium on the testing of such weapons and restating a willingness to negotiate an agreement on a formal test ban.

"Now there is a moratorium on tests. We would like to formalize this moratorium into a formal obligation," said senior government official Brajesh Mishra. "We are prepared for those talks."

The diplomatic overtures marked a shift in the post-testing posture of the coalition government led by the Hindu-nationalist Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP), which aims to project a strong India internationally.

The government of Prime

Minister Atal Bihari Vajpayee underscored the import of its new conciliatory stance by substituting Mishra, his top aide and a former ambassador to the United Nations, for a Foreign Ministry spokesman at a regular news briefing.

Escalating recriminations between India and Pakistan about each other's intentions in Kashmir have raised fears of a third war over the disputed Himalayan territory.

"There is no question of a war with Pakistan. We're not going in for a war with Pakistan," Mishra replied when an Indian journalist asked if India would bomb camps inside Pakistan that India alleges are used to train militant Muslim insurgents to fight for control of the Indian-ruled portion of Kashmir.

On Monday, the cabinet member in charge of India's domestic security, Home Minister L.K. Advani, warned Pakistan against trying to support the Kashmir separatists. Pakistani Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif responded Tuesday with an accusation that India had threatened to attack

the portion of the territory under Pakistan's control.

[India's Defense Ministry accused Pakistan today of firing across the border to cover the movement of Muslim militants into Jammu and Kashmir, the only Muslim-majority Indian state, the Associated Press reported. Meanwhile, Pakistani officials accused Indian troops of firing without provocation across a military control line in Kashmir, killing one Pakistani soldier and wounding another, the Reuters news agency reported.]

Mishra's offer to resume talks with Pakistan -- which broke off last year over the Kashmir issue -- followed by one day a similar offer by Vajpayee after a visit to India's nuclear testing site. Vajpayee said talks could continue if Pakistan approaches India first, but Mishra said that only means that India awaits Pakistan's response to an unspecified proposal made by a previous Indian government in January.

Mishra also sought to ease tensions with China, which has criticized the nuclear tests and

Washington Post

May 22, 1998

Pg. 35

accused India of occupying Chinese territory in India's far northeast. U.S. intelligence services have said China has supplied nuclear weapons technology to Pakistan, and Pakistan's top diplomat returned Wednesday from Beijing, where he sought security guarantees from China, according to Asian diplomats.

"We want to have very good relations with China," Mishra said. Indian analysts have consistently described China as more of a security threat than the smaller Pakistan, which India has defeated in three wars since 1947.

Concerning the United States, Mishra characterized as "regrettable" heated exchanges that included a State Department accusation that India had purposely duped U.S. officials about its nuclear testing plans and condemned Advani for his remarks about Pakistan. India had responded by accusing State Department officials of using undiplomatic language.

"We hope that is behind us. . . [and] more normal interaction would be possible from now on," Mishra said.

Washington Times

May 22, 1998

Pg. 1

Taiwan frets about talks between U.S. and Beijing

By Ben Barber
THE WASHINGTON TIMES

The Taiwan government's senior spokesman expressed concern yesterday over President Clinton's impending Beijing summit, saying Taiwan should not be discussed by the two heads of state.

"Our future and destiny should not be the topic of discussion by third parties," particularly when one of them is China, said Chien-jen Chen, director-general of the Taiwan Government Information Office in Taipei.

After earlier expressions of concern that Mr. Clinton and

Chinese President Jiang Zemin might strike a deal affecting its interests, Taiwan received public and private assurances it had nothing to fear.

But now Taiwan has gone further and asked that it not be on the U.S.-China agenda at the talks set for June.

"The visit is a major concern," said Mr. Chen at a luncheon with editors and reporters at The Washington Times yesterday.

Taiwan had been equally "concerned" about Mr. Jiang's visit to Washington in October, he said.

"We were briefed thoroughly last October and this time also have been briefed by the administration," Mr. Chen said.

"We have been told the purpose of the visit is to improve relations between the United States and the People's Republic of China and to try and engage the PRC more in the international community and eventually maintain and stabilize peace in the region.

"We have no objections. We are

all for it. But not at the expense of our interests," the Taiwan official said.

He said the Clinton administration gave assurances in private and public that the visit would not adversely affect Taiwan.

But he said "we are concerned if the Strait of Taiwan or Taiwan is to be discussed" at the Beijing summit.

Taiwan worries that the summit "might affect military sales" even though "we have been told this would not happen," the official said.

China has been building a blue water navy and a missile force capable of projecting military power throughout East and Southeast Asia. India cited worries about China's military might as a justification for setting off its five nuclear explosions last week.

Taiwan officials have been seeking to buy submarines to counter the threat of a Chinese invasion or blockade, especially since the 1996 Chinese missile tests off Taiwan meant to intimidate voters during Taiwan elections.

"Not only India and Taiwan but

all of Southeast Asia is concerned about the buildup of the PRC navy," said Mr. Chen.

Taiwan believes it could at present repel any Chinese attempt at an amphibious landing on Taiwan. "Their loss would be astronomical," said Mr. Chen.

The 1996 crisis was sparked when the United States granted a visa to Taiwan's President Lee Teng-hui to speak at his alma mater Cornell University. China saw that as a move by Taiwan toward independence.

The official U.S. policy toward China holds there is only one country, controlled by Beijing, and Taiwan exists as a separate entity represented by an "office" in Wash-

ington.

This delicate diplomatic situation is spelled out in three U.S.-China communiques signed: in 1972 under President Nixon; in 1979 under President Carter; and in 1982 under President Reagan.

"Our concern is that they might sign a fourth communique" during the June visit, said Mr. Chen.

"Each time [there is a U.S.-China summit] it affects our interests adversely."

But he added that "we have been assured there will be no fourth communique."

Despite the political and military jousting between the two Chinese governments, business is booming and Taiwan has invested

\$37 billion in the mainland, said Mr. Chen. Since 1987, when cross-straits relations thawed, there have been 11 million visits to the mainland by Taiwanese and 250,000 mainlanders have visited Taiwan.

But the chill that fell over relations between Beijing and Taipei after the Lee visit to Cornell remains an obstacle.

Cross-straits talks that began in 1991 and stalled in 1995 resumed in April when Taiwan sent a delegation to Beijing.

"They were not warmly received," said Mr. Chen. Further talks are set for fall.

European Stars & Stripes

May 22, 1998

Pg. 2

Monitors Say Croatia Isn't Trying To Reform

VIENNA, Austria (AP) — The 54-nation Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe blasted Croatia for its failure to undertake genuine democratic reform, allow Serb refugees back or encourage Serb residents to stay.

A 34-page report by the OSCE mission in Croatia obtained by The Associated Press criticized virtually every aspect of Croatian political life — from legal reform to election laws, media control by the rul-

ing party and harassment of the Serb minority.

Measured by the standards of western Europe, which Croatia aspires to join, the OSCE said the country falls far short of the mark, despite many statements of intention to do better. The report follows several recent criticisms by the West, which is threatening economic sanctions if Croatia doesn't improve.

"Many positive steps have been promised, some of these steps have been announced, but

few have been implemented," the OSCE report said. "Regrettably, in some areas no steps have been made at all. As a consequence, the course of post-war normalization has been delayed: democratic reforms in legislation, the judiciary and the media are still at a very early stage. This delay has had a clear and negative impact on reconciliation." Specifically, the report said Croatian authorities have blocked the return of most of the 190,000 Serbs who fled Croatia in 1995,

when its troops recaptured areas seized by the Serbs in 1991. Local authorities even actively discourage Bosnian Croats now occupying Croatian Serb homes from going home to Bosnia, it said. In the easternmost region of Croatia known as Eastern Slavonia, a formerly Serb-held area returned to Croatia after two years of United Nations' administration, the OSCE said authorities actively discriminate against Serbs.

Defense Daily

May 22, 1998

Pg. 4

Cohen Charges Atlantic Command With Joint Experiments

As expected, Defense Secretary William Cohen has charged Adm. Harold Gehman, the commander-in-chief of the U.S. Atlantic Command, as the executive agent for all of the Pentagon's joint warfighting experiments effective Oct. 1.

In his new role, Gehman will be responsible for exploring, demonstrating and evaluating warfighting technologies, concepts and capabilities needed to realize Joint Vision 2010, the U.S. military's long-range strategic vision.

Army Maj. Gen. George Close, the director of operational plans and interoperability on the Joint Staff, told *Defense Daily* earlier this month that the Atlantic Command was the logical choice to take over the functions because of its "exhaustive training role" and oversight of 11 of the Pentagon's 41 Advanced Concept Technology Demonstration programs that test emerging technologies (*Defense Daily*, May 13).

"U.S. Atlantic Command's new role will focus our efforts to implement our future warfare vision," Army Gen. Henry Shelton, the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, said in a statement yesterday. "The services have individually made great strides in modeling and simulation, and other new techniques. Our challenge now is to integrate those efforts to achieve the greatest possible capabilities in the 21st century."

The joint warfighting experiments—which range from small wargames to large-scale training exercises—will foster the development of new joint doctrine, organizations, training and education, equipment, leadership, and personnel to ensure the U.S. military is prepared to meet a varied range of uncertain future threats.

ACOM in its new role will develop a program for conducting joint warfighting experiments as well as defining future experiments. Currently, the military services, as well as other defense agencies, conduct such experiments.

Gehman must furnish Shelton by July 15 with "an implementation plan that specifies the resources required to assume these new responsibilities. The chairman will coordinate with the services and the Defense Department to establish the procedures and funding to support for [Atlantic Command] joint warfighting experimentation," the statement adds.

The Atlantic Command's oversight of the experiments will become permanent on the next revision of the Unified Command Plan. Gehman's role as executive agent is defined by the Joint Warfighting Experimentation Charter that Cohen approved on May 15.

Navy cancels CARAT 98 exercises with Indonesia

★ USS Belleau Wood scraps port call to Thailand to be ready for possible U.S. evacuations.

By R.J. KELLY

Stripes Senior Writer

TOKYO — Political tensions in Indonesia have prompted the U.S. Navy to cancel planned training with Indonesian forces and modify some plans for a separate international exercise in Thailand.

The Indonesian portion of the annual six-nation Cooperation Afloat Readiness and Training (CARAT 98) has been canceled, Cmdr. Glendon King, a spokesman for Pacific Command headquarters in Hawaii, confirmed Friday.

In a related development, the amphibious assault ship USS Belleau Wood and its affiliated ready group, based at Sasebo Naval Base, Japan, has canceled a scheduled port call this weekend to Pattaya, Thailand. The ready group will remain near northwestern Indonesia in case Americans need to be evacuated, U.S. officials said.

The Belleau Wood had been sched-

uled to take part in Cobra Gold exercises in Thailand, but a Defense Department statement Friday said the amphibious ready group will remain "prepared to conduct any mission they are called upon" in relation to the Indonesian uprising.

Defense Secretary William Cohen said the Belleau Wood will remain near Indonesia "until such time we decide whether it will continue and participate in Cobra Gold."

How much the delay will affect long-planned Cobra Gold events was unclear Friday.

As part of the separate CARAT 98 exercise, about 1,700 Navy and Marine personnel are now in Brunei, where the first phase of the annual multinational exercise got under way May 4. Training with Indonesian forces was to have been the next stop, but was put on hold last week as the domestic unrest which resulted in Thursday's resignation of President Suharto continued.

The CARAT fleet had been scheduled for a port call in Bali, Indonesia, on Tuesday, followed by about two weeks' training with Indonesia. The U.S. group will now bypass Indonesia and train with Malaysia in June, according to Lt. Cmdr. Cate Mueller, spokeswoman for Naval Logistics Group, Western Pacific in Singapore.

The remainder of the long-planned international training exercise in Southeast Asia waters will continue, King

said.

A fleet of eight Navy ships and a host of affiliated units based in Japan, Guam, Hawaii and California are scheduled to move on to Malaysia, Thailand, Singapore and the Philippines as part of routine annual training with those nations.

CARAT 98 was originally scheduled to end Aug. 5.

The Aegis guided missile cruiser USS Mobile Bay, based at Yokosuka Naval Base, Japan, had been scheduled to leave Yokosuka this weekend to temporarily replace the Yokosuka-based destroyer USS Cushing in Indonesia, but that is no longer necessary, 7th Fleet officials said.

Mobile Bay skipper Capt. Joseph M. Volpe Jr. said his ship will continue with its planned three-month cruise through Southeast Asia and Australian waters, scheduled to begin about June 1.

In addition to the Cushing, which is carrying a helicopter detachment from Atsugi Naval Air Facility, Japan, other CARAT 98 participants include: the Sasebo-based dock-landing ship USS Fort McHenry, carrying Marines from the 3rd Marine Expeditionary Force, Okinawa; naval aircraft deployed via Kadena Air Base, Okinawa; various units from Guam; members of the 7th Fleet Band from Yokosuka; and naval logistics staff in Singapore. Other ships involved in CARAT 98 are the USS Sides, USS Monsoon, USS Hurricane, and the submarines USS Houston and USS Jefferson City, all based in San Diego, Calif., as well as the USS Salvo, based at Pearl Harbor, Hawaii.

International Herald-Tribune

May 22, 1998 Pg. 1

Saudi Nationals Were Dhahran Bombers

AFP

KUWAIT - Saudi Arabia's interior minister, Prince Nayef ibn Abdel Aziz, acknowledged for the first time Thursday that Saudi nationals were behind the June 1996 bombing of a U.S. military base in the eastern city of Dhahran. He said the blast had been "carried out by Saudi hands."

Washington Times

May 22, 1998

Pg. 4

Army is drawing fire for letting general quit

Pentagon continues probe of woman's charges

By Rowan Scarborough
THE WASHINGTON TIMES

A draft Pentagon report is highly critical of the Army for letting Maj. Gen. David R. Hale retire while under investigation on a woman's complaint that he coerced her into a sexual relationship, a source close to the probe said yesterday.

The Pentagon inspector general is primarily investigating the charges of Donna-maria Carpino, whose husband, an Army colonel, served under Gen. Hale in Turkey

in 1997. The two subsequently were divorced.

The source said the IG report, which is still in progress, "damns" the Army for letting Gen. Hale quickly retire in February with the probe only a month old.

Army officials say Gen. Dennis Reimer, the Army chief of staff, was aware Gen. Hale was under investigation but did not know the specific charges. Gen. Reimer defended his decision as proper in a recent TV interview.

The case has raised questions of whether

there is a double standard in the service favoring senior officers. The Army has vigorously pursued lower-ranking enlisted personnel accused of similar sexual misconduct.

The Army maintains it can recall Gen. Hale to active duty for punishment, if merited, although it cannot cite a case of such a recall. Defense Department officials say the Army has no plans to re-summon Gen. Hale no matter what the final IG report concludes.

Mrs. Carpino says Gen. Hale tricked her into a sexual relationship by saying he would protect her husband against adultery charges from four other officers. Her ex-husband says he never committed adultery and accuses Gen. Hale of fabricating the charges.

Meanwhile, Gen. Hale's attorney, Lt. Col. William Kilgallen, said yesterday that Defense Department investigators have reached "tentative conclusions" on Mrs. Carpino's complaint.

Col. Kilgallen said he is preparing a written response he hopes to deliver early next month. The timetable means the Pentagon IG likely will not file a final report with Defense Secretary William S. Cohen until midsummer.

Col. Kilgallen declined to respond to reports that the IG's office concluded that Gen. Hale acted improperly. But he did say the findings "are based on information entirely absent of any input from General Hale or people desiring to speak on his behalf."

"It does not set out findings," Col. Kilgal-

len said. "It sets out what they called 'tentative conclusions.' Basically it's a snapshot and an invitation to comment."

Gen. Hale has declined so far to speak with investigators.

Mrs. Carpino said yesterday that IG agents talked to many people. "They have talked to everyone they could possibly find, and most of the time the IG tried to discourage me by playing the role of being the 'bad cop' with me. I received little of the 'good cop' story. It wasn't until The Washington Times first presented this story that the ... IG made an attempt to really investigate."

Mrs. Carpino said investigators refused to give her a lie-detector test. She took three, costing \$1,700, at her own expense. All showed she was telling the truth, the examiner's reports said.

"Now, they are using my charts as part of the evidence," she said.

Mr. Cohen has ordered Pentagon General Counsel Judith A. Miller to investigate the circumstances surrounding Gen. Hale's retirement.

An aide to Ms. Miller told Mrs. Carpino the probe was limited to lines of communications between the Army and the IG. It is not focused on whether Gen. Reimer acted properly, he told her.

Mr. Cohen said later, however, that the general counsel was reviewing all aspects.

But last week, Mrs. Carpino received a letter from Ms. Miller. She wrote that her review "is a limited examination of the Army's regulatory methodology for processing the retirement applications of general officers and the application of that process to Maj. Gen. Hale's retirement."

Washington Times
May 22, 1998
Pg. 18

Israel pushes Russia on Iran's nukes

JERUSALEM — Israel has given Russia a list of Russian firms that it says are providing military technology to Iran, particularly in the nuclear field, an Israeli minister said yesterday.

Trade and Industry Minister Natan Sharansky, who is currently visiting Moscow, said on Israeli television that he had given the list to the Russian authorities. "They have promised to act against these firms. But our aim is to do everything to ensure that this translates as quickly as possible into results on the ground," he said.

In April, the Jerusalem Post said Iran had bought two nuclear warheads for \$25 million from a former Soviet republic. The Post cited purported 1991-92 secret Iranian government documents in which Iranian intelligence officers spoke of obtaining "two tactical nuclear weapons from Russia" for \$25 million.

Wall Street Journal

May 22, 1998

Pg. 16

Sanctions Don't Stop Nukes

By MELVYN KRAUSS

President Clinton's imposition of punitive economic sanctions on India in response to its nuclear weapons tests is a futile gesture that will have little impact on India's economy. The sanctions ban exports of military equipment to India, discontinue aid and loan guarantees and stop U.S. banks from lending to Indian government projects. But while alarm over the nuclear tests is certainly warranted, a more productive response would be to dramatically speed up the development of antiballistic-missile systems.

The economic sanctions will not change India's behavior. New Delhi surely knew before it conducted the tests that the U.S. would impose economic sanctions in retaliation: The Nuclear Proliferation Prevention Act of 1994 requires it. The fact that the Indians went ahead with the tests suggests the new nationalist government believes the benefits of testing their weapons exceed the likely costs of sanctions. Unless India's leaders find they miscalculated the costs and benefits, which is unlikely, they will not back down.

U.S. sanctions will have only a minor impact on the Indian economy. As became

clear at last weekend's Group of Eight summit meeting in Birmingham, England, few industrialized countries are following America's lead in imposing sanctions. What India will no longer get from the U.S., other nations will supply. If India must reduce, for example, its purchases of Boeing aircraft because it is denied financing from the U.S. Export-Import Bank, Europe's Airbus will step in to provide planes. If U.S. banks are forced to cut back their operations in India, European banks will take their place. Indian workers who leave the U.S. because they can no longer remit money home can and will find work in other advanced countries.

While sanctions will hurt India little, some U.S. business will lose lucrative opportunities. But this loss may not be a bad thing for the overall U.S. economy. To the extent that the lost business is due to reductions in U.S. aid and subsidized-loan programs to India, this country's economic efficiency improves while taxpayer dollars are saved. Aid and subsidized loans are a form of disguised protectionism. Artificial increases in U.S. business abroad created

by foreign aid and subsidized loans are no less harmful than artificial increases in domestic business due to tariffs. Mr. Clinton has done the right thing for the wrong reasons by cutting back on wasteful government programs.

It is possible to guard against nuclear proliferation without the ineffective tool of economic sanctions. Research and development of antiballistic-missile systems, which can shoot down enemy missiles, must be sped up and given much more resources. Mutually Assured Destruction worked to prevent a nuclear conflagration during the Cold War, when only two nations were powerful enough to annihilate one another. However, as nuclear weapons proliferate to other countries, we can not rely on MAD any longer. The Indian tests should remind the administration, which has been dragging its feet on missile defense, of the urgent need for an antiballistic-missile system.

Mr. Krauss is a senior fellow at the Hoover Institution, Stanford University.

South Asian Nightmare

By Stephen S. Rosenfeld

It is past time to pay attention to one of those developments that float in the haze of the generally known and the specifically neglected. Everyone knows that India and Pakistan divided and still dispute Kashmir. But people are slow to grasp that the same powerful sources of nationalism that are driving predominantly Hindu India's reach for full nuclear status are also impelling it to reclaim the part of Muslim-majority Kashmir that India previously lost to Pakistan in war.

So it is not simply that the new BJP-led Hindu nationalist government is ignoring American-approved international rules that bar nuclear testing. This is a development fraught with its own destabilizing strategic implications in the region and beyond. The Indian government also is conducting a hard-line policy that could produce a fourth Indian-Pakistani war, the third over Kashmir. Except that this time the confrontation would be between two states that have both pronounced themselves nuclear-capable.

India's hot pursuit of guerrillas it claimed Pakistan had infiltrated into Kashmir is a common scenario for how a war between the two might begin. But it would not be your routine poor-country clash. The nuclear potential could make it something of a kind not seen since the Cuban missile crisis of 1962. The South Asian nightmare suddenly starts to look real.

Some of India's American friends see in its testing not the creating of a new crisis of nuclear proliferation. Rather, they see the correcting of an old strategic and political error that had denied India the great-power status due a nation of its culture, democracy and world weight. To me that is a sanguine and unproven reading. Surely it would make a difference, for instance, if India and Pakistan went again to war.

In any event, the latest evidence of Indian intent on Kashmir lies not in the movement of troops but in public

words. Words? It was precisely our intelligence agencies' inattention to Indian public words on going nuclear that produced a major embarrassment when the words turned out to be true.

Read the BJP's election manifesto. "To take active steps to persuade Pakistan to abandon its present policy of hostile interference in our internal affairs by supporting insurgent and terrorist groups," the Kashmir item begins, using India's own terms for what Pakistan calls forces seeking independence or self-rule. The BJP manifesto goes on to "affirm unequivocally India's sovereignty over the whole of Jammu and Kashmir [the state's full name], including the areas under foreign occupation." These areas under Pakistani control are called Azad or Free Kashmir by Pakistanis and

Pakistan-occupied Kashmir by Indians.

"We do not covet anyone else's territory, but we have taken a vow to take back what is ours," the new prime minister, A. B. Vajpayee told a BJP rally in Bombay on Feb. 25.

And just last Monday, warnings against Pakistani support for a separatist Muslim insurgency in Kashmir sparked some defiant words from L. K. Advani. A high-ranking BJP hard-liner, he is in charge of domestic security and runs the paramilitaries in Kashmir. "Islamabad should realize the change in the geostrategic situation in the region and the world [and] roll back its anti-India policy especially with regard to Kashmir," he said. India's declaration of itself as a nuclear power "has brought about a qualitatively new stage in Indo-Pakistan relations," he went on, and "signifies -- even while adhering to the principle of no first strike -- [that] India

is resolved to deal firmly with Pakistan's hostile activities in Kashmir."

At a Canadian Embassy dinner this week, U.N. Secretary General Kofi Annan said he would consider a trip to Pakistan and noted that Pakistan favors (India opposes) U.N. mediation in Kashmir. He said that the previous Gujral government in India had undertaken a calming foreign policy and that "with the new [BJP] government and its current attitude, it is going to be very difficult to get them together on Kashmir."

The desirability of timely notice of crisis is much hailed in diplomatic circles these days. But early notice cuts more than one way. It permits diplomatic preemption. But it also puts the party receiving the advance word on the spot. No matter; on the explosive question of India's intentions in South Asia, we have been warned.

Defenseless America

By Charles Krauthammer

It's not the tests that matter; it's what they prepare you for. India's underground nuclear explosions are in themselves quite beside the point. The problem is that they enable the Indians to now "weaponize" their nukes (they have had the bomb since at least 1974) or, to put it differently, nuclearize their military. India will build a force of nuclear-tipped missiles, something that only the United States, Britain, France, Russia and China (and possibly Israel) have now.

Pakistan will inevitably follow suit. China will beef up its already formidable nuclear missile force. And those countries from Iran to North Korea that are clandestinely developing theirs will continue apace.

The lesson of the Indian bomb and the cycle it has both accelerated and exposed is obvious: Nonproliferation efforts can at best slow down the spread of weapons of mass destruction; they cannot stop it. They may buy us an extra five or 10 or 15 years. Nothing more.

Nonproliferation measures

are valuable because the more we slow down the inevitable, the more time we have to prepare for it. Unfortunately, the Clinton security policy stops with nonproliferation. Clinton had counted on a unilateral American moratorium on nuclear testing and the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) to exert moral pressure to keep the likes of India from joining the nuclear club.

Nice try. And now what? Clinton's response at the G-8 summit was characteristically feckless and naive. He was reduced to (1) sputtering that India's nuclear policy was "nutty," and (2) calling for redoubled efforts to get the CTBT ratified. India's explosions had just proved the CTBT irrelevant, but no matter.

Within a decade or two, we will be facing regimes, some quite nasty, that possess missiles armed with nuclear, chemical or biological warheads. What do we do about it?

The obvious answer is to build anti-missile defenses. Today, if a nuclear missile were launched accidentally toward, say, Washington there is absolutely nothing we could

do to prevent the incineration of the city. The good news is that for the first time in history a "bullet-hitting bullet" to shoot down that missile is within technological reach. The bad news is that this administration has little interest in building it.

Our leaders love the Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty far more than they love anti-ballistic missiles. And the entire purpose of the ABM treaty is to ensure mutual American and Soviet defenselessness.

Soviet? With the demise of the Soviet Union, the ABM treaty became a relic, an obsolete agreement contracted with a nonexistent country to deal with an outdated problem (the temptation of asymmetrically defended countries to attack preemptively). It could -- it should -- have been declared void. Failing that, we should have recognized Russia as the successor to the treaty.

What did Clinton's clever arms controllers do? Last September in New York, they signed an agreement extending the ABM treaty not just to Russia but to Kazakhstan, Ukraine and Belarus too. They multiplied the number of parties to the treaty from one to four -- making it virtually im-

possible for any future administration to revise the treaty to allow us to build the defenses we need.

Moreover, the New York agreement invaded an area that the ABM treaty was not supposed to deal with at all. The original treaty bans only "strategic" defenses -- i.e., of the American homeland. Bad enough. The Clinton extension of the ABM treaty, however, also constrains "theater" ABM systems -- those we are now developing to defend our

troops in the field. The new treaty restricts, for example, the velocity of our interceptors -- which means that our theater defenses will be degraded and dumbed down.

Clinton's arms controllers have thus ensured not just the defenselessness of American cities to missile attack but greater vulnerability of American forces abroad too. Nor is this threat merely theoretical: During the Gulf War, a single Scud missile caused 20 percent of all American casualties.

The greatest travesty is that all this is being done unconstitutionally. The Senate has not ratified this treaty extension, yet the administration is already implementing it -- for instance, exchanging information with the two countries about the capabilities of our theater missile systems.

The Clintonites, of course, believe this is all God's work. They believe an ABM treaty provides better protection for the United States than ABMs. That may have been true in the

bipolar world of 1972, when the treaty was signed and we faced thousands of Soviet nukes, a threat no ABM system could meet. But today the threat is an accidental or unauthorized launch or a small but lethal barrage from, say, a North Korea or Iran.

Not to worry, says the administration. There will be no ballistic missile threat to the United States before 2010. How do they know? The CIA assures us.

As it did about India.

Boston Globe

May 21, 1998

Pg. 18

Chemical Warfare In The Senate

A couple of US senators, abetted by an inattentive President Clinton, are about to pass implementing legislation for the Chemical Weapons Convention that would sabotage the forceful and carefully drawn treaty against the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction.

Senator Jesse Helms of North Carolina long opposed Senate ratification of the Chemical Weapons Convention, a treaty that was backed by Ronald Reagan and George Bush and whose inspection provisions were conceived and tested by the American chemical industry. After losing the fight against ratification, Helms and Senator John Kyl, an Arizona Republican, tried to undermine the convention by writing spoiler provisions into the implementing legislation to be voted on tomorrow.

The most obvious of these poison pills is an exemption that would allow the US president to refuse, on the grounds of national

security, any challenge inspection of a US site. It is ironic that Helms and Kyl should be seeking to knock out this underpinning of the treaty, since it was the Reagan administration that originally insisted on the inspections to ensure effective verification.

Iran, Pakistan, and India are eager to emulate the Helms-Kyl rejection of challenge inspections and another provision that would prevent chemical samples from being sent to The Hague for independent analysis. These and a few other spoiler provisions, if left uncorrected, would unravel an arms control treaty tailored by US specialists and executives to serve US interests.

When the implementation bill was being drafted, the White House sent to the Senate a couple of executive branch officials who were not familiar with the crucial verification requirements of the treaty. Foolishly, they acceded to the poison-pill provisions. The best way to undo the damage is to pass the implementing legislation - bringing the United States into compliance with the treaty - and then pass corrective legislation before the end of this congressional term.

New York Times

May 22, 1998

Setting The Sextant Aside

In a 1942 handbook for merchant seamen called "How to Abandon Ship," there is a terse chapter on navigation. "If your lifeboat is without a navigator," it begins, "these directions are for you." Nautical history is full of stories about small boats guided across the oceans by experienced celestial navigators, often by amateurs, like the redoubtable Joshua Slocum, and sometimes by professionals who are driven to extremity, such as William Bligh or Ernest Shackleton. Celestial navigation -- the art of using a sextant and the heavenly bodies to determine one's position -- is, in fact, a central element of nautical tradition.

So it comes as a melancholy surprise to learn that at Annapolis the course on celestial navigation will no longer be taught because, the Naval Academy says, it has been antiquated by modern satellite-linked computer systems. The timing of the announcement was ironic, coming as it did the day after a communications

satellite failed, disrupting beeper service all over the nation. The satellites on which the Navy relies are unlikely all to fail at once, yet it is hard to ignore the feeling that perhaps the Navy has put a little too much faith in the redundancy of its electronics and too little faith in the valuable human redundancy of teaching midshipmen a self-reliant and time-tested means of finding their way across open water.

A modern Navy crew, forced to the lifeboats by calamity, would probably never be called upon to seek some distant landfall, as Bligh and Shackleton did. Search and rescue is a pinpoint business these days, although that also often depends on satellite navigation. Still, almost anyone would prefer to find himself in the lifeboat with a celestial navigator and a sextant aboard rather than the one carrying a navigator -- minus computer -- who had been instructed only in satellite navigation. Morale, the authors of "How to Abandon Ship" remind us, "is frequently the total of little things."

New York Times

May 22, 1998

China's Military-Civilian Complex

By Evan A. Feigenbaum

CAMBRIDGE, Mass. -- In high dudgeon, the House overwhelmingly passed a bill this week that would prohibit the export of satellites to China. The action was a quick response to a string of allegations that the Clinton Administration changed its policy on satellite

exports to China after the Democratic National Committee received donations from agents of the Chinese military and American businessmen.

Banning all satellite exports may seem like a quick, easy solution, but it doesn't address the real problem: how to encourage trade while protecting national security. In other

words, how can we determine whether exported technology will be used for military or peaceful purposes?

In the case of China, all sides in the debate have distorted the role of Chinese weapons makers in acquiring sophisticated technology.

Many technologies that China seeks -- fiberoptics, for instance, or supercomputers -- can be used in weapons, but they also have important com-

mercial applications. This puts the American regulators in the Commerce, State and Defense Departments in charge of such sales in an awkward position. How do they know what the technology will be used for?

Regulators generally try to solve this problem by carefully determining whether the buyer has ties to the military. If the buyer does have such ties, then many regulators assume that the technology must be for use

in weapons. If a buyer seems to be from a civilian enterprise, then it is assumed that the technology will be used for commercial purposes.

This strategy is supposedly effective because China has recently put in place new hurdles that separate the research and manufacture of weapons from civilian industry.

But this picture is not completely accurate. When it comes to planning what technologies the Chinese Government should invest in, the military and civilian bureaucracies are almost completely interconnected -- so much so that finding a distinction between the two is practically impossible.

Indeed, China has been so technologically backward for so long -- and its cadre of leading scientists and engineers is so small -- that the Government has routinely mobilized

civilian workers for weapons development projects. For decades, university professors, nonmilitary bureaucrats and members of the Chinese Academy of Sciences have all played important roles in planning China's weapons program.

But don't jump to the conclusion that every civilian project has a hidden military objective or that China is primarily concerned with making weapons. Of course, China is trying to modernize its arsenal. But arms development is no longer the country's most important goal.

China is now concentrating on improving its industrial base and developing new technologies like biological engineering. Indeed, many of the same people who built nuclear weapons, missiles and military satellites have been the driving

force behind this shift. Military planners are deeply involved in setting goals for many civilian industries, like energy plants and automated factories, which have little to do with weapons.

Since 1986, China has pursued what it calls the 863 program, which concentrates Government investment in seven distinct areas, like information technology, which have both civilian and military applications. But only two of those areas, lasers and space technology, are supervised by the Government's weapons development agency.

And even in these areas, much of the money is invested in research for civilian technology.

The 863 program is not a state secret, yet many United States policy makers and members of Congress continue to assume that military goals remain paramount in China. They

fail to see that just as the technology has many uses, China has many different reasons for seeking foreign technology.

We must come to grips with this reality. The House ban on satellite sales is a hasty and foolish way to begin a review of our policy on high-tech imports. The real goal should be to lighten the unrealistic burden now placed on the American regulators in various departments and agencies. What we need is a more realistic method of assessing technological exports to China -- one that recognizes just how complex and interconnected its high-technology system is.

Evan A. Feigenbaum is a fellow at the John M. Olin Institute for Strategic Studies at Harvard and the author of a forthcoming book on the role of the military in China's high-technology development.

Washington Post

May 22, 1998

Pg. 38

The Great UNSCOM Paper Chase

By Nora Boustany

According to U.S. officials and representatives of the U.N. Special Commission (UNSCOM) in charge of supervising Iraq's dismantling of weapons of mass destruction, the media had it all wrong when the recent standoff with Iraq was attributed to that country's blockage of inspection of suspected weapons sites.

The crisis erupted in February, when UNSCOM officers could not gain access to a particular location in one of Saddam Hussein's eight presidential palaces, where they were seeking documents on weapons programs -- not actual weapons or arms manufacturing activities, as reported. "Literally, certain locations were of interest as a possible site for documents on weapons programs. UNSCOM never had an interest in presidential sites per se, when the Iraqis declared the palaces off limits," a U.S. official said on background.

"UNSCOM was pretty direct about this from the very beginning," the official said,

"but the Iraqis had more than enough time to remove anything. . . . They did this whole flap on the presidential palaces when UNSCOM personnel were trying to get access to a particular location and were turned away. They were seeking documents."

Iraq is obligated to account for its weapons of mass destruction and provide records and documentation, he explained.

Twenty foreign diplomats, including an American ambassador, toured the eight palaces several weeks ago in keeping with an agreement worked out by U.N. Secretary General Kofi Annan. The broad issue remains, however, about whether Iraq was going to be allowed to dictate terms for inspection to the world community, noted a diplomat who went on the tour.

Diplomats who took part in the inspections describe surreal and lavish palaces with imported marble and lion-shaped faucets -- grandiose opulence jarring to the image of poverty that Iraqi authorities emphasize to visiting journalists. Inside the palace at Tikrit, hometown of the Iraqi leader, there is a 30-yard-high indoor waterfall, many artificial lakes, canals and reflection pools. The eight complexes comprise 1,000

structures, including palaces and storage sheds, a diplomat said. "There are caretakers. But one does not come away with the impression that any of these are really used for anything yet," he said, adding that more construction is going on.

Hard to See Gingrich, Harder to See Helms

Sadaka Ogata, the U.N. High Commissioner for Refugees who goes to bed every night worrying about 23 million refugees, is in Washington this week to lobby on their behalf. At times, it's not easy.

When in Davos, Switzerland, for an international conference, House Speaker Newt Gingrich apparently has no problem being an internationalist, but on his home turf, it is a different ball game. "Gingrich I can see in Davos, but in Washington it is difficult," Ogata said with measured mystification during a lunch in her honor at Blair House Wednesday. She has also tried very hard -- and failed -- to get an appointment with Sen. Jesse Helms (R-N.C.), her aides said.

On the other hand, Donna E. Shalala, secretary of health and human services, praised her "extraordinary" guest for having earned the respect of the world for representing vulnerable people "who nobody wants."

"I don't like to think I take care of people who nobody wants, but rather those who need protection," Ogata clarified politely.

The last seven years have been a learning process, she said. "In Iraq, the [allied] military did the job and handed [humanitarian] matters over to us. In Bosnia and Rwanda, we learned how to work with the military. Instead of existing to fight or defend their country, they are learning how to serve human beings, and they like it," she said of armies that have put their infrastructure at the disposal of humanitarian operations.

She said Afghanistan now poses the largest single challenge in terms of resettlement problems, with 3 million refugees having fled to Iran and Pakistan. "Bringing in food solves the plight of refugees only temporarily but not the structural issues," she explained.

The plights of displaced people from the former Yugoslavia and in the Great Lakes region in central Africa rank second and third, she added.

The United States -- which accepts 78,000 refugees per year, a ceiling set in consultation with Congress in a presidential directive -- has a well-established network of social workers and church groups for

introducing those selected to reside here to their new lives. The U.S. figure has dropped from 120,000 in the early '80s.

With a Dark Cloud Comes a Silver What?

Chien-jen Chen, Taiwan's information minister and chief government spokesman, told

Washington Post editors and reporters yesterday that the crisis with China that brought U.S. battleships to the coast of Taiwan three years ago was "a dark cloud, but the lessons [learned from it] are the silver lining."

The majority of people on the island prefer stability and

the status quo rather than any jolts toward unification or independence, he said, and this compels proponents of independence to moderate their demands and China -- which considers Taiwan to be a renegade Chinese province -- to take account of the alienation triggered by its threats.

The minister said Taiwan does not want U.S.-Chinese ties to be at the expense of its own interests. "Now Taiwan is a working democracy. People have newly acquired wealth as well as dignity, and they don't like their future to be decided by third parties," he pointed out.

Give Pakistan A Reason For Restraint

Los Angeles Times

May 22, 1998

By Mansoor Ijaz and James A. Abrahamson
Special to the Los Angeles Times

In the aftermath of India's five nuclear tests, world opinion is virtually unanimous that Pakistan should exercise restraint. But what reasonable options does the world, particularly the United States, offer Pakistan for its security in return for maintaining such restraint?

The Clinton administration must develop a new vision for South Asian security with provisions based on a strategic shield of superpower defense systems much as the United States provides NATO members and Japan and not on resumption of Cold War levels in conventional military armaments and revocable economic aid.

The need for such a security arrangement is compelling because while Pakistani nuclear tests may rebalance the overall (nuclear plus conventional) regional security equation with

India, crossing the weapons threshold in Islamabad and New Delhi may yet deeply disturb the delicate global equilibrium achieved for the rest of the world's current and aspirant nuclear states. The incentive for Iran to go nuclear, for example, would intensify greatly after a Pakistani test.

Pakistan's security could be enhanced in part by Western powers guaranteeing that India be given no favorable treatment, such as relaxation of licenses for technology, under provisions of global test ban or nonproliferation treaties, should India sign on in the aftermath of its tests.

Another component of the security arrangement might include the United States initially assisting Pakistan with technological and logistical support to set up sophisticated surveillance systems. For example, ground monitoring facilities could coordinate with geosynchronous satellites scanning microwave traffic over South Asia. Low orbit optical imaging satellites could

constantly survey known nuclear weapons sites. Longer term, such early warning systems could be buttressed by a defensive anti-missile capability to counter potential attacks.

To make such a proposal palatable for Islamabad's rightly skeptical political and military circles, such facilities could be operated by joint American and Pakistani units under modified provisions of the International Military Exchange and Training program. The initial costs of such an operation could come from what would have been spent for the other forms of aid that the United States was prepared to offer in exchange for Islamabad's no-test commitment.

America not only would benefit by entering the region as a nuclear stabilizer, but also would be able to build a platform for providing political support to Pakistan in its efforts to finally resolve the Kashmir dispute and bring peace to Afghanistan. Afghan stability would enable access routes for Central Asian oil and gas to be

opened for transport to the Indian Ocean. Resolving Kashmir would allow for dramatic reductions in regional military spending.

One could imagine an undemonstrated but nuclear-capable Pakistan as South Asia's hub of energy development, with Exxon refineries, Unocal pipelines and Shell distributors rather than a tragically depressed nation of underfed, illiterate and religiously zealous people hovering under an umbrella of nuclear bombs.

Only with America's impenetrable technological support and President Clinton's moral courage to act decisively can the world be assured of adequate security for more than one-quarter of humanity.

Ijaz is chairman of an investment management company in New York. His father was a founding contributor to Pakistan's nuclear program. Abrahamson was director of the Strategic Defense Initiative under President Reagan from 1984-89.

USA Today

May 22, 1998

Our View

A Double-Edged Connection

It would be hard to overstate the seriousness of the latest allegations of corruption in the 1996 Clinton campaign.

Fund-raiser Johnny Chung now admits that he collected nearly \$100,000 from a Chinese military officer/aerospace executive and gave it to the Democratic national Committee under other names.

To the embarrassment of the administration, at about the same time President Clinton overruled the State Department and made it easier for U.S. firms to export potential missile technology to China.

Quid pro quo? Clinton heatedly denies it and, indeed, no evidence of one has emerged. But House Speaker Newt Gingrich rushed to name a special investigative panel into whether national security had been breached. Cries for an independent counsel to look into the Clinton's campaign funding grew louder and louder.

Indictments may someday follow. But the argument is missing the point.

Gingrich says his investigation has nothing to do with campaign funding.

But, in fact, neither foreign intrigue nor criminality is the underlying issue.

The nation's practice of putting politics up for bid is.

That's evident even in Chung's case. The Chinese contributions are dwarfed, for example, by the \$1 million contributed to the Democrats since 1995, by New York aerospace executive Bernard Schwartz, whose firm (by coincidence) has given satellite-launching business to China. And that's quite legal.

Focusing on the hand-wringing on the China angle is a convenient distraction from a reality the Republican leadership (and many Democrats) would like to avoid: It's possible for Chung or anyone else in either party to disguise a big foreign donation because of the cherished campaign-law loophole that permits and encourages just such big gifts from domestic special interests.

What insiders call the "soft money" exemption permits otherwise illegal six- and seven-figure contributions from U.S. corporations, labor unions and wealthy individuals who want something from government. Tobacco, oil and gambling interests, big-shot

lawyers and big-name unions do it. As long as unlimited soft money is allowed, there will be no opportunities for foreign contributions to sneak in under the tent.

The China charges deserve criminal scrutiny. But members of Congress wailing about foreign influence on the government would do better to drop their opposition to thorough campaign reform and support pending legislation to close the soft-money

loophole.

It won't end corruption or the appearance of corruption. It's a long way from the better solution: taking public control of campaign finance to drive out all special-interest money.

But it would dam the flow of suspicious-looking contributions. Assuming only the already illegal 1% of the flow comes from abroad will make little difference.

More On The China Connection

TWO CURRENTS joined in the House Wednesday to produce an extraordinary bipartisan indictment of President Clinton. One current flows from the shortfall in space-launch capabilities that for years has forced the United States to look to China to launch its ever-growing numbers of civilian space satellites. So pressing is the American need that even when Washington tightened technology-transfer standards after the Chinese massacre of dissidents in 1989, a national-interest waiver was included to keep launches possible.

The other current flows from Bill Clinton's vulnerability to criticism on account of fund-raising practices in 1996 and specifically on account of the large contributions (1) by a Chinese military officer affiliated with a Beijing aerospace company and (2) by the president of Loral, of the big American satellite industry. For the House, these disclosures were the last straw. With most Democrats joining in, it moved to repudiate the administration's past handling and future control of all satellite and weapons

Washington Post
May 22, 1998

Pg. 24

technology exports.

In 1996 one of those Chinese launches failed, and in its aftermath the Justice Department opened a criminal investigation into whether the Loral and Hughes companies had violated laws against sharing sensitive information. Thus rose the specter of American assistance to a Chinese missile program. Still, last February Mr. Clinton gave the requisite waiver to a Loral subsidiary to send up another satellite on a Chinese missile. Justice worried that the new deal could affect the criminal probe, but the national security departments, as well as Commerce, approved. The administration insists it's an unexceptionable deal of the sort that has become routine in two administrations. The House found it "not in the national interest" 417 to 4.

Now the administration and both houses of Congress are in an investigative mode. Grave charges affecting not just campaign integrity and political reputation but national security remain to be explored and resolved. They must include whether the United States should be hitchhiking at all on Chinese rockets.

Opposing View

Real Issue Is Clinton's Character

By Dana Rohrbacher

If someone's character is so lacking that he or she is willing to betray our country for money, changing the rules on campaign financing isn't going to make a difference. So don't link the transfer of missile technology to China with campaign finance reform. It just doesn't correlate.

In this case, it appears president Clinton eased the way for several U.S. aerospace companies to transfer technol-

ogy that enhanced the capability of Red Chinese rockets to land in the United States, callously disregarding the safety of every, man woman and child in the country. I don't believe the president made decisions concerning these activities based on campaign contributions. That would be too horrible to contemplate. So let's just give him the benefit of the doubt, at least for the time being.

What we are now seeing may just be a case of a donor placing his money with a candidate who is of a like mind.

The more distressing news is recent reports confirming that money from the Chinese army was funneled into Clinton coffers. No matter the donor, proving a quid pro quo is unnecessary, because the real issue here is the policy mind-set that would support the transfer of such sophisticated technology to the Communist Chinese.

The job now is to establish what technology was transferred, when it was transferred and under whose authority. This won't be easy, given the Clinton's administration's tal-

ent for evasion and obstruction. Already, stories of the destroyed memos of Pentagon watchdogs have surfaced. This scandal only will grow and the attempt to link it to campaign-finance reform only diverts our attention from the serious job of fixing responsibility for putting the American people in jeopardy.

Rep. Dana Rohrbacher, R-Calif., is chairman of the House space and aeronautics subcommittee and a member of the House Asia/Pacific affairs subcommittee.

USA Today
May 22, 1998

Defense Information & Electronics Report

May 22, 1998

Pg. 5

Committee boosts Y2K spending by \$1 billion

HOUSE PANEL RAPS PENTAGON FOR POOR MANAGEMENT OF INFOTECH ACCOUNTS

The House National Security Committee, concerned the Pentagon is not managing properly its \$26 billion C4 account, is recommending a slew of funding adjustments and policy changes, including a whopping \$298 million reduction in what it claims are redundant information technology programs as well as a \$1 billion boost for DOD Year 2000 compliance activities.

The committee's fiscal year 1999 defense authorization report, released last week, runs roughshod over a number of the Defense Department's IT initiatives. The committee notes, for example, that it is very worried DOD managers are not exercising enough control in key areas, like interoperability testing and certification, migration strategy of legacy systems, and Year 2000 compliance.

To "refocus" IT management at the Pentagon, the National Security Committee has included language in its bill that would clarify and expand the roles of the chief information officers in the Office of the Secretary of Defense and military services. DOD's CIOs, the bill states, should be reviewing budget requests for information technology and

national security systems, and guaranteeing the interoperability of these systems.

The \$1 billion set-aside for Y2K compliance results from the committee's contention DOD has not provided "the appropriate level of attention to the information technology priorities of Year 2000 compliance and IT infrastructure developments," the report reads. As such, the bill protects IT infrastructure programs from internal transfers or reductions during fiscal years 1999, 2000, and 2001.

"The committee recommends reallocating funds in the budget request from lower priority IT systems and IT systems that will be executed after the year 2000, to provide for a \$1 billion increase in funding for Year 2000 compliance," the report states. Additionally, the committee directs more attention be paid to mission critical systems that may fail at the turn of the century.

To get the \$1 billion, the committee goes after programs like the Army's Joint Computer-Aided Acquisition and Logistics Support, which has suffered from "continued program slippage" and will be fielded after 2000. JCALS is to be cut by \$33.2 million (see related story). The delayed Defense Civilian Personnel Data System would be trimmed by \$6 million, and the Army Recruiting System -- a redundant effort, according to the committee -- sliced by \$3.8 million.

Other than mentioning these programs, the committee is not very specific as to where the rest of the money would come from. The committee's bill language notes that "of the amounts authorized to be appropriated . . . for information technology and national security systems of the Department of Defense designated as mission critical, not more than 25 percent may be used to fund" activities not related to Y2K repair.

In a section entitled "Redundant Information Technology Programs," the House committee is no more precise as to where it gets its recommended \$298 million in funding cuts. It notes DOD has provided a report to Congress identifying those IT systems to be replaced by "newer" IT systems. However, the committee has determined that some of the systems scheduled for elimination are still getting lots of money.

One redundant program cited by the committee is the Air Force's Financial Information Resources System (FIRST). House lawmakers claim that although a decision was made to move all defense agencies and services onto a single program, budgeting and accounting system (PBAS), the Air Force "has refused to move to the new system." But FIRST, the committee says, duplicates PBAS.

Accordingly, the committee cut \$7 million from FIRST in the FY-99 request and encourages DOD "to upgrade the interoperability of PBAS."

The committee, continuing with its laundry list of problems with DOD's IT programming and planning, says the terms "joint" and "global" are being badly misused. For example, the Global Combat Support System (GCSS) will not be a single system, although its name implies as much. Rather, it will be at least four systems: GCSS-Army, GCSS-Air Force, GCSS-Navy, and GCSS-Joint Chiefs of Staff, the committee says.

That structure is actually by design. The Pentagon's General Officers Steering Group, overseeing the development of GCSS, makes it clear that GCSS is not a system at all. Rather, it is an architecture, and a series of standards and functions to which individual applications must conform. It is up to each component to develop GCSS-compliant software. That concept appears not to have been sufficiently elucidated to Capitol Hill.

"The committee does not believe that there is a justifiable requirement for developing unique systems for each military department, instead of a single, joint system integrating all logistics, medical, transportation, finance and personnel systems," the committee writes.

"The committee is convinced that there should be joint, interoperable systems in all areas of DOD, from electronic malls to Automated Identification Technology and computer security training centers." -- *Richard Lardner*

San Diego Union-Tribune

May 21, 1998

Budget Limit Is Pinching The Marines

Annual shortfall of \$500 million cited

By Otto Kreisher
Copley News Service

WASHINGTON -- The failure of Congress to authorize future money-saving base closings will not hurt the Marine Corps as much as the other services because it did not count on those savings in its long-range budget planning, Gen. Charles C. Krulak said yesterday.

However, the Marine Corps commandant said the refusal of

congressional leaders to lift the balanced budget agreement's limits on defense spending leaves his service \$500 million a year short of what it needs for weapons and equipment.

Krulak said Defense Secretary William S. Cohen and the three other services assumed there would be billions of dollars a year in savings from additional base closures when they prepared budgets and modernization programs for

the Quadrennial Defense Review.

The Defense Department needs those base-closing savings to pay for a new generation of ships, aircraft and other weapons that the services plan to buy early in the next century, Krulak said.

But the two versions of the 1999 defense authorization bill now on the House and Senate floors did not include authority for base closing rounds in 2001 and 2005, despite the pleas by Cohen and the service chiefs.

Pentagon spokesman Ken Bacon said Cohen now must decide whether to cut the

planned buys of equipment or to try to close bases without the more efficient Base Realignment and Closure Commission process.

The Marines, however, did not plan for savings through base closures because they do not have much in the way of excess facilities, Krulak said.

That does not mean that the Marines might not have some bases on a future closure list if there are additional rounds, he said.

Krulak said the Marines need a big increase in funds to replace equipment that is reaching -- or is past -- its normal service life and is increasingly difficult to maintain.

He has told Congress that

the nearly \$700 million for procurement proposed in the fiscal 1999 defense budget is about \$500 million short of what the Corps needs.

But attempts by the leaders of the House National Security Committee and others to increase the defense spending limits in the balanced budget agreement were rejected by the

Republican leadership in both chambers of Congress.

If that is not reconsidered, the Marines will have to keep using aged equipment, such as the 40-year-old CH-46 helicopter, which has exceeded its expected service life, Krulak said. "I'm very concerned about that," he said.

Krulak said the Corps already has cut 2,000 active-duty

personnel to save some money for modernization after fighting for years to keep 174,000 Marines on active duty. "For us, that's very hard," he said.

And it will be even more difficult to find further cuts in personnel or other programs to get additional money for modernization, he said.

On another matter, Krulak

defended the Marines' policy of training recruits in gender-segregated units, while supporting the decisions by the Army, Navy and Air Force to train the sexes together.

"My personal feeling is, each service chief should have the right to decide what's the best way to train his people," he said.

Boston Globe

May 21, 1998

Pg. B6

Naval Engineers Use Technology To Teach Old Ironsides New Tricks

By Anne Kornblut
Globe Staff

ABOARD THE USS CONSTITUTION - In a matter of weeks, Navy Captain Rick Hepburn will take command of a guided missile destroyer project in Maine, supervising a \$1 billion-a-year contract to build a powerful 21st century fleet.

But for now, the future can wait.

Like a doctor treating a national hero, Hepburn, along with 40 engineers from the Naval Sea Systems Command in Washington, D.C., have begun conducting a delicate physical exam of the USS Constitution, whose 200-year-old wooden hull is at the center of a national debate over whether to sail it in open seas.

Yesterday, Old Ironsides endured its first pokes and prods. As it was tugged from port, its deck hooked up to \$1 million in computer terminals, electrical nodes and potentiometers - which measure electromotive forces - the aging vessel seemed ill at ease with all the newfangled attention.

In the cramped boatswain's locker - where the rigging lines are stored - six engineers crouched uncomfortably around two computer terminals. In the next cabin, the captain ducked under a wooden beam to cross to the other side of the deck.

"That" Hepburn said, pointing to a 6-inch electronic device clamped to the side of the ship, "sends an electrical signal as the wood beam is stretched and pulled."

Hepburn proudly ticked off a few more technical designs. Then he acknowledged the strange dichotomy of his mis-

sion. "I've done some strange things in my career," he said. "But this? This is an engineering dream, to measure an icon like this."

The tests result from debate over the integrity of the ship's structure, prompted by the announcement last year that the Navy planned to take the warship on several excursions - including Portsmouth, Newport, and, on July 4th of the year 2000, to the harbor of New York City. Despite \$12 million in renovations and a successful sail last summer - the first in 116 years - a group of the ship's former commanders protested last month, saying that to risk a voyage in open waters would be "foolhardy."

The tests will not yield solid

results for at least several weeks. Once finished, engineers will have concrete diagrams of the ship's strengths and weaknesses, including the amount of pressure exerted on the hull when attached to a tug boat.

During the eight-hour trial run, which took the ship roughly 50 nautical miles from the Charlestown Navy Yard to off Cohasset, some of the 72 crewmembers lingered above deck in the 80-degree weather, remarking on the good fortune of extremely calm seas.

Below, however, in fluorescent-lit cabins, engineers moved computer mouses at a furious rate, calling diagrams onto screens with each incom-

ing test. Pausing only briefly to enjoy the mission, they looked up from their screens when a cannon boom signaled the ship's entry into international waters.

"Oh, cool," said Thomas Brady, 43, who had been aboard since shortly after dawn.

At day's end, Commanding Officer Chris Melhuish said Old Ironsides appeared in relatively good health. Standing on deck, he said "it was balanced, right on target."

And Hepburn, still charged with analyzing the data, said the mission "gives us hope."

"Hopefully we can hold onto the ship awhile longer," he said.

Atlanta Journal

May 20, 1998

Pg. 13

Bills Would Hike Standards Military Doctors Must Meet

By Jeff Nesmith

The armed services would be required to set up a monitoring system to make sure physicians at military hospitals have unrestricted state medical licenses and keep pace with continuing education requirements, under bills introduced in both the House and Senate on Tuesday.

"Our military personnel and their families are sacrificing quite a bit to protect our country's security and dominance in the world.

They deserve our gratitude and the best medical care we can provide for them," said Rep. David Hobson (R-Ohio), who introduced the bill in the House.

"This is basically a very

simple piece of legislation, but its impact will be very significant to improving the quality of care." An identical bill was introduced in the Senate by Sen. Mike DeWine (R-Ohio) and James Inhofe (R-Okla.).

DeWine and Hobson predicted that the legislation will pass as part of the Defense Authorization Act, which was being debated Tuesday night in the House. Hobson said the need for the bill was brought to light in a series of articles detailing problems in military health care published in October in the Dayton Daily News.

The Dayton Daily News is owned by Cox Newspapers, which also owns The Atlanta Journal-Constitution.

He said that nearly every

member of the House Appropriations subcommittee on national security, which conducted hearings on military health care in the aftermath of the newspaper series, had signed on as co-sponsors of his bill.

Among problems brought to light in the newspaper series was the fact that the Army, Navy and Air Force were accepting doctors who held "special licenses" from the state of Oklahoma as fully licensed physicians, even though they had not been required to pass the same rigorous medical examinations required for other physicians in Oklahoma and elsewhere.

After the Defense Department learned of the practice, officials said military doctors holding special licenses were told they must obtain unrestricted state licenses or leave

the service.

Hobson also noted that the national security subcommittee had created a blue-ribbon panel "to monitor changes made by the Pentagon and ensure that they are effective in improving the quality of medical care for active-duty personnel and their families."

Romania Buys U.S.-Made Unmanned Spy Aircraft

BUCHAREST, Romania (AP) — Romania has purchased six U.S. Shadow-600

unmanned spy planes for \$20 million as part of an effort to bring its military up to NATO

standards, the Defense Ministry said Wednesday.

The unarmed planes will be delivered in June under a contract with AAI Corp. that also includes radar stations and ground control equipment.

Legi-Slate

May 21, 1998

Senators Scold Lockheed On New Plane, Then Dole Out Millions To Buy More

By George C. Wilson
Legi-Slate News Service

WASHINGTON (May 21) - Lockheed Martin Corp. got a good scolding from the Senate Armed Services Committee recently for allowing development of an advanced C-130J transport plane to run way over cost and two years behind schedule.

But no matter. The committee voted to add \$382 million to the Pentagon's procurement budget to buy four C-130J aircraft that defense officials didn't ask for.

"A disgrace," Sen. John McCain, R-Ariz., called this inconsistency by his committee colleagues.

But if past is prologue, McCain's outrage will not embarrass enough Senate or House lawmakers into deleting the millions for unwanted planes from what is widely regarded as a tight defense budget bill [S. 2057] [H.R. 3616]. Even so, the Senate committee's handling of the the C-130J program provides an unusually sharp insight into how rhetoric and action can conflict on a program championed by the right people in Congress.

"The committee views with concern the slow progress of the C-130J program, the increased expense of developing the aircraft, which could be borne by the [Defense] Department in higher prices for production C-130Js, and notes the Department's failure to provide a report on remanufacture of existing C-130 airframes," the panel said in a report accompanying the fiscal year 1999 defense authorization bill [S. 2057].

The Pentagon did submit a

report on the plane, the committee said, but did not answer the question it was asked to address: whether it made more sense to remanufacture existing C-130 airframes rather than build new ones as Lockheed is now doing with the "J" model, the latest version of the venerable C-130 transport plane.

The senators noted that Lockheed launched the C-130J program as a commercial venture, with development costs estimated at \$350 million to be spread over the first 120 planes sold -- many to foreign allies -- rather than billed to the U.S. government. And since this is a commercial program, "exact cost accounting has not been available" to Pentagon officials, they said.

"However, it has been estimated that the program has cost more than \$900 million and is over two years behind schedule," the committee said. "Considering the delay in the development of the aircraft and reported overruns in development costs, the committee views with concern the future of the C-130J program."

"Accordingly, the committee recommends a provision that would require the secretary of defense to report to the congressional defense committees on the impact of delays and overruns."

Having expressed its qualms, the committee then increased the Pentagon's budget request from \$63.8 million for one C-130J to \$381.8 million for five C-130Js. The committee authorized \$191.4 million for three C-130Js for the Air National Guard; \$85 million for one EC-130J configured for Air Guard special operations warfare; \$75.4 million for one

WC-130J for weather reconnaissance conducted by the Air Force reserve squadrons; and \$30 million for a C-130 ground simulator.

This closely mirrored a decision late last month by the House National Security Committee to authorize nearly \$398 million for the same five C-130 variants plus two KC-130J refueling tankers for the Marine Corps that were not in the Pentagon's budget request.

McCain, who has championed a campaign to rid the federal budget of congressional pork-barrel spending, felt compelled to speak out in an "additional views" section of the Armed Services Committee report.

"The problem of continued procurement of C-130 aircraft despite an enormous surplus of such platforms in the Air Force inventory solely to provide federal tax dollars for specific congressional districts is worse than ever," McCain said.

"During the very time when it is incumbent upon Congress to deal responsibly with the budget for national defense, the addition of four C-130J aircraft is irresponsible. To add these aircraft in the same bill, the accompanying report for which is highly critical of the C-130J program for cost overruns and development delays, is a disgrace."

"These aircraft represent real money, over \$200 million, at a time when the majority party is supposed to be concerned with about inadequate force structure, readiness, missile defense, counterproliferation and the federal deficit."

"This addition completely defies logic and portrays Congress in the worst light. Congress' proclivity to fund National Guard programs irrespective of other higher priorities on account of the Guard's representation in every state and most congressional dis-

tricts has been another continuing problem for many years. That the aforementioned C-130Js are designated for the Air National Guard is a case in point."

House Speaker Newt Gingrich, R-Ga., has been unabashed champion of the C-130s and its variants, which are built in Marietta, Ga., on the edge of his congressional district. Senate Majority Leader Trent Lott, R-Miss., an ally in past efforts to add C-130 money to Pentagon budget requests, has been particularly interested in the WC-130J for reserve squadrons in his state, which use them to monitor hurricanes.

One Air Force general told LEGI-SLATE News that costs of the C-130J have risen so high that Lockheed Martin has had difficulty selling as many abroad as the company had hoped, putting additional pressure on its lobbyists to have Congress line up more military orders for the plane.

Pentagon fiscal 1999 budget documents peg the C-130J price at \$125.8 million apiece, with \$62 million of that amount for spare engines and parts.

Ray Crockett, communications director for the Marietta-based Lockheed Martin Aeronautical Systems, said the basic C-130J model costs about \$50 million, but modifications drive up that price. He said the company has sold 83 C-130Js to date: 28 to the U.S. government, 25 to Britain's Royal Air Force, 12 to the Royal Australian Air Force and 18 to the Italian Air Force.

Asked about the alternative of remanufacturing existing C-130s and McCain's criticism of furnishing brand new C-130Js to Air Guard and Air Force Reserve squadrons, Crockett said maintenance costs of refurbished C-130s would be high and that U.S. reserve

forces would be "much less effective in meeting global commitments" if they were not modernized.

Besides Gingrich and Lott, Lockheed Martin has cultivated a wide array of other powerful

lawmakers over the years. For the 1998 election, the firm's political action committee has given about \$559,000 to candidates for the House and Senate as of May 1 -- more than any other defense industry PAC, Federal Election Commission

records show.

An analysis of FEC records by the Center for Responsive Politics in February showed that the Lockheed Martin Corp., its PAC and its officers and employees had given

roughly \$678,700 in individual contributions and so-called soft money donations to party organizations, nearly double the total contributions from defense giant Northrop Grumman Corp.

Cobra Gold Marines feast on jungle buffet

★ Wild plants, bugs and cobra blood among the delicacies on the survival-training menu.

BY RICH ROESLER

Stripes Taegu Bureau Chief

SAMAEAN, Thailand — If you pick up a poisonous cobra by the tail, keep wiggling it a little to keep it disoriented. If you're stuck in the woods, you can cook sweet rice inside tubes of bamboo.

And if you're munching on a grasshopper snack, be forewarned that, well, the insect's legs can be a bit prickly on the way down.

With the jungle for their pantry, Thai marines on Wednesday served up a wide variety of wild plants, bugs and cobra blood to wide-eyed U.S. Marines.

The food was part of a Royal Thai Marine jungle survival class taught to Americans during the annual Cobra Gold military exercises in Thailand. The class included makeshift animal traps, treating water and a display of about 20 poisonous animals to watch out for: toads, snakes, a centipede the size of a carrot and scorpions.

"Move at night. Use the daylight to observe and plan," said a Thai officer lecturing about 100 U.S. Marines at this base south of Bangkok.

His remarks were occasionally punctuated by the nervous clucking of three chickens that by the end of the class would meet an untimely end.

As an assistant in a camou-

flage beret held up the plants, the officer talked about the tastiness of about two dozen plants: edible flowers, vines, ferns, leafy fronds and seedpods. There were small prickly fruit that tasted like strawberry, a root that looked like a turnip but tasted like an apple and roasted bamboo. As the officer described each, the smiling assistant obligingly ate a little to demonstrate that it was, in fact, edible.

Toward one end of the long table were several plates of dead insects: shiny black beetles, grasshoppers, caterpillar larvae and, the featured entree, two 3-inch long black bugs resembling cockroaches.

The U.S. Marines crowded around the bugs.

"C'mon, eat it. No, wait — you peel off the wings first."

As his colleagues gawked, Lance Cpl. William Woods popped a black beetle in his mouth.

"When he starts hurling, I'm gonna laugh," chuckled a doubter.

As people watched, Woods slowly chewed.

"The legs are kind of gross," he announced, "but it's not too bad. It's kind of sweet, it really is."

Thus began the insect feeding frenzy, with Marines crowding around to try the stuff. "The cocoons taste like fries."

A staff sergeant, goaded into it by his men, crunched down one of the finger-long cockroachlike bugs. "Tastes like chicken," he said.

Even reporters and photographers tried the bugs. A fat

Pacific Stars & Stripes

May 22, 1998 Pg. 1

brown beetle the size of a quarter was crunchy and a little salty. A grasshopper was crunchy on the outside, oily on the inside, and the legs were a little hard to swallow.

"Not what you think a bug would taste like," mused *Stripes* photographer Clayton Farrington, peering at the remaining half of his grasshopper. "Starchy, kind of like a potato. A potato with an exoskeleton."

Soon many of the bugs were gone. "No, I've had two already," one Marine said at the offer of another beetle. "I'm fine, really."

Next came the snake class. Thai marines opened a wooden crate and pulled out a 5-foot-long cobra, which slithered along the ground in front of the Marines.

"Oh, HELL no!" said a lance corporal from Seattle, staring as the snake opened its hood and poised in front of the Marines. The Thais scooped it up with a stick.

As the snake hissed and struck at a beret held in one hand as a decoy, a Thai Marine reached down and grabbed the snake behind its head.

"Long after a snake's head is cut off, his reflex actions can cause him to bite and inject the poison," the lecturer said. His advice on how to behave when encountering a poisonous snake in its natural setting: "Kill it with a long stick."

As the U.S. Marines stared, the Thai Marine used a bayonet to saw off the cobra's head. The blood was drained into a bowl, mixed with alcohol and passed around in a canteen cup between Marines of both countries in the crowd.

"I'll stick to the damn chicken MREs," muttered one U.S. Marine.

Thais demonstrated how to gut and skin the headless snake, its body still wriggling and curling around in the air.

"My country can eat anything," the lecturer said. "If it's animal or plant, we can eat it."

Finally, when the chickens had been relieved of their heads, class was over.

"I hope you enjoyed my class," the Thai lecturer said.

The Marines applauded. Some of them wrapped up bugs to-go for friends who couldn't make it to the class.

Pentagon helps Thais limp to war games

Washington Times

May 22, 1998

Pg. 19

KANCHANABURI, Thailand — Thailand and the United States launched their annual Cobra Gold military exercise this week, aimed at improving the two countries' combat readiness and at enhancing their security ties.

This year's exercise, the 17th, involves 5,500 Thai troops and 11,000 Americans. The United States has sent 91 aircraft and three warships.

The budget for the exercise is estimated at \$2.5 million, of which Thailand is shouldering 20 percent.

CURRENT NEWS SERVICE

ROOM 4C881, PENTAGON, WASHINGTON, D.C. 20301-7500
Tel: (703)695-2884 / 697-8765 Fax: (703)695-6822/7260

CHIEF: Richard Oleszewski NEWS DIRECTOR: Taft Phoebus EARLY BIRD EDITOR: Linda Lee

EDITORS: Elmer Christian, Erik Erickson, Janice Goff, Meredith Johnson

SYSTEMS ADMINISTRATOR: Carol Rippe ADMINISTRATION: Wendy Powers PRODUCTION: Defense Automated Printing Service (Room 3A1037)